



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2010

No. 6

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

January 20, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN T. SALAZAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, Creator of heaven and Earth, Eternal Shepherd of the living and the dead, as a Nation we unite with other nations of the world and pray for our suffering brothers and sisters in the poverty-stricken and Earth-shaken nation of Haiti. Have mercy on us all.

We beg You to help all the people of Haiti in all their needs. Come to the aid of the afflicted. Take pity on the helpless and the most vulnerable. Raise up the fallen as well as the ruins where human life and human remains may be still hidden. Restrain the wayward and sustain the brokenhearted. Bring compassion to those who mourn and eternal life to those who are buried in anonymity.

For, with the people of Haiti, we call upon You, Lord, as the everlasting Redeemer and Resurrection, both now and forever.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### WALL STREET REFORM

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Wall Street Bonus Tax Act. The legislation introduced by Congressman PETER WELCH would right a terrible wrong.

Right now, dozens of the financial institutions responsible for the economic meltdown are reverting right back to their old bad habits. They are getting ready to clap themselves on the back for the great job they think they've been doing by giving themselves billions of dollars in bonuses. But the thanks and the bonuses should go not to the bankers at Goldman Sachs and Citigroup and the others; it should go back to the American people.

It was the American people who stepped in and saved the banks from themselves. It was the American people who pumped billions of taxpayer dol-

lars into Wall Street to keep it from melting down and taking the rest of the economy with it. And it should be the American people who reap the benefits of that action, not Wall Street banks.

Congress should pass the Wall Street Bonus Tax Act and give the American people their money back.

### SECOND SHOT HEARD AROUND THE WORLD

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1775, 235 years ago, shots rang out in Massachusetts that forever changed the history of the world. British redcoats were ordered to seize the weapons of the American militia, even though it's never a good idea to try to disarm the American people.

The famous midnight ride of Paul Revere warned the Minutemen that the invincible British were coming. And as the sun rose over the town of Lexington, Massachusetts, the first shots rang out against the British tyranny, shots heard around the world.

At the north bridge of Concord, patriots fought the British Army. The mighty British were defeated and turned back towards Boston. These were the first battles of the American Revolution to throw off the yoke of tyranny for a new idea of freedom.

The people of Massachusetts have fired a second shot heard around the world. Yesterday, they fired back against big, intrusive government, not with bullets, but with ballots. The Senate election was a statement for freedom over oppression. Our government, like the British, would do well never to underestimate the American people.

And that's just the way it is.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H195

### HONORING STAFF SERGEANT DANIEL MERRIWEATHER

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a Memphis, Shelby County citizen who gave his life in service to our country in Afghanistan, Staff Sergeant Daniel Merriweather. He was the second soldier from Shelby County to die in Afghanistan since the beginning of Operation Enduring Freedom and our 12th in the Middle East since 2002. Staff Sergeant Merriweather, who was with the 118th Military Police Company, died when his convoy ran over an improvised explosive device.

He graduated from Overton High School in Memphis, Tennessee. He studied broadcast journalism, played football, loved sports, cowboy hats, boots, and country music. And you can see from his picture and from the reflections of his friends how much he loved life and how popular he was.

He wanted to serve his country, and he did so. He did two tours of duty, one in Afghanistan and one in Iraq. At 25 years of age, he is survived by his wife, Rachelle; his two children, 3-year-old Kale and Daniel Merriweather, Jr., just 3 months old; his parents, Pamela and Darryl Finnie; his sister, Adrienne; and his brother, Darryl Finnie, Jr.

These are the 12 soldiers who died from Shelby County, and unfortunately Staff Sergeant Merriweather joins that company.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a moment to honor the service and memory of Staff Sergeant Merriweather.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Sergeant Merriweather.

### PRESIDENT'S INAUGURATION ONE YEAR AGO

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, the President was sworn into office, giving Democrats full control of Congress and the White House. After promising the American people a misnamed stimulus plan to keep unemployment under 8 percent, we see 10 percent unemployment continuing to cripple families.

Three hundred and sixty-five days later, the American people still haven't seen this Congress focus on job creation policies to promote small businesses. Instead, the American people have been saddled with more borrowing, more taxes, more spending, and increased deficits. As shown in Massachusetts, the American people support limited government, not failed big government.

Seven million Americans have lost jobs since Democrats took Congress, and now Americans want real change. It's time the Democrats get this mes-

sage and get their priorities straight: Drop this backroom government health care takeover and take up job creation policies.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

### MAIN STREET NEEDS HELP

(Ms. SUTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, last fall, at the end of the last administration, we all know that America's largest financial institutions and companies were on the brink of collapse, and the Federal Government, and more importantly, the American taxpayers came to their rescue. But let's be clear: We did not do that because we were fans of their behavior. We did not appreciate even then the excessive greed that was driving Wall Street without any sense of responsibility. We helped them because ordinary citizens were being crushed, and we hoped to get the credit flowing.

So what has happened? Wall Street has experienced recovery, but Main Street still needs help. Wall Street needs to help pay for the revitalization of Main Street, and that is why I support the Wall Street Bonus Tax, which is going to levy a tax on those excessive bonuses that the Wall Street banks have the audacity to continue to give out even as the plight of our middle class is suffering.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do everything we can to stand up for the American taxpayers and the people who live in our communities.

### LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FROM SPECIAL ELECTION IN MASSACHUSETTS

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United States Senate special election in Massachusetts offers many lessons for both Democrats and Republicans. Surely among them are these:

All true reform starts with the voice of the people.

Moderation beats extremism.

Common sense triumphs partisanship.

Voters can exercise real independence.

One-party control leads to arrogance.

There are few guaranteed election results.

Listen to the people, don't defy them.

Of course some will say there are no lessons to be learned or that the result of this special election should be ignored or can be explained away. But those who don't listen to the people, Democrats or Republicans, will pay a steep political price.

### AMERICANS WANT REAL CHANGE

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. It's clear from the results last evening that the voters are angry. They haven't seen the change in direction that they thought they voted for 1 year ago in November.

Now, some Republicans will see it as an endorsement to turn back to the failed policies of the Bush years that put us in this mess. That wasn't the message. But the message is they want real change. They want the reform of Wall Street. They're tired of business as usual where the fat cats make out and the taxpayers get the bill. They want to see real reform in health care, take on the insurance industry, take on the pharmaceutical industry.

The Obama administration kicked off health care reform with a deal with the pharmaceutical industry. Now, that is not the kind of reform the American people want to see.

We need to step back and put forward a package of real reform. Take away the antitrust exemption of the health insurance industry; lower the cost of health care for all Americans; make the policies better; take on the pharmaceutical industry; allow people to reimport drugs from Canada that are exactly the same as the drugs sold here at a fraction of the cost. Those are the kinds of concrete steps people want to see.

### HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION CONTAINS A MARRIAGE PENALTY

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, while there is controversy about the pending health care legislation, one point where there should be bipartisan agreement is that the Federal Government should not penalize people simply for being married.

After review, it appears that both the House and the Senate bills contain significant marriage penalties. In the House bill, an unmarried couple with an income of \$25,000 each would have their combined premiums capped at \$3,076 per year. If the couple gets married, their annual premium cap drops to \$5,160 for the same insurance. In short, there is a \$2,084 penalty for simply being married.

While under the Senate bill it would be less, the marriage penalty would still exceed \$1,500 a year. Simply put, a marriage penalty on the middle class is just one more reason to dump this government takeover of our health care system.

### A NEW ECONOMIC VISION

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we know that job creation is Congress's job one, and we passed some time ago a great job creation engine for a clean energy economy in the United States. We passed that months ago in the U.S. House, and we know we have a tremendous opportunity for job creation. Building electric cars: I drove a Ford Focus all-electric car a couple of months ago. Building solar thermal plants: We now have contracts developing out in the Southwest. Building new energy-efficient windows: We heard from an entrepreneur the other day about the tremendous advances in energy efficiency.

Yet, to realize this economic vision, the U.S. Senate needs to get off the dime and pass a clean energy bill, and those who think that we should do nothing because Copenhagen didn't reach an agreement, I'll tell you what: the Chinese are not waiting. They're building solar plants. They're building electrical lithium-ion batteries. They're building new energy-efficient windows.

The U.S. Senate needs to join us and create a job-creating engine with clean energy and pass the energy bill.

#### "NO" TO THE PELOSI TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues in the House are ignoring the American people. Our constituents are holding rallies, posting blogs, talking with their neighbors, writing to their Congressmen, and are doing everything in their power to get them to listen.

The American people are telling us loud and clear: they don't want a government takeover of health care.

Listen to them. Massachusetts did. Americans want, need, and deserve better than a budget-busting, trillion-dollar health care bill when 10 percent of Americans are still unemployed. They are tired of sweetheart deals, secret meetings and dirty politics. There is still time to do what's right, to do what the people are asking us to do. Vote against the Pelosi takeover of health care.

#### A SOBERING PICTURE

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a map from a new report by the Government Accountability Office that I requested in my role as Chair of the Joint Economic Committee. The report provides a detailed understanding of the state of the housing market at the end of June 2009, and it provides a sobering picture of the housing crisis this administration, President Obama, inherited.

By the end of last June, 1.7 million of the nonprime mortgages that originated from 2000–2007 had completed the foreclosure process. This map shows the estimated percentage of seriously delinquent nonprime loans by congressional district. It also serves as a map of the economic damage and social pain caused by lending practices of the past decade that were unsound by any measure.

Last year, this House passed financial regulatory reform to protect both consumers and our economy from the damaging effects of predatory lending. This sobering map is a reminder of why this legislation needs to pass into law.

#### A BACKROOM DEAL TO INCREASE THE NATION'S DEBT LIMIT

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I saw the article in this month's Washington Post about the Obama administration's cutting a backroom deal with the Democrat leadership to create, by Executive order, a commission to deal with our Nation's excessive spending.

I am opposed to creating this panel by Executive order, and the American people will be opposed. Congress should be voting to create this commission, and it should be requiring that it act on the panel's recommendations.

What the President and the Democrat leadership have agreed to, which has only now come around to addressing the issue because they need political cover to increase the debt limit, is a fig leaf. This is the same group that has pushed our deficit to record levels and that has continued to write check after check from an account which already has a negative balance.

The American people will be cut out of the process. It is a backroom deal; and under this deal, the recommendations will be voted on by a lame-duck Congress, filled with retiring and defeated Members. This is wrong. Any action should be taken by a newly elected Congress, not one on the way out the door. Creating this commission by Executive order is the wrong way to go. We have to get this right. Too much is at stake.

#### JOB CREATION

(Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, during the Bush administration, the unemployment rate nearly doubled. We hemorrhaged millions of jobs, including 743,000 jobs that we lost in January 2009 when President Obama was sworn in. They made the mess, but we have to fix it.

Thankfully, this President and the Democrats in Congress have put measures in place to stabilize our economy

and to begin to create jobs for the more than 15.3 million people who are unemployed. To those who are actively seeking a job but who can't find one, the economy has begun to move again.

We have extended unemployment. We have extended COBRA benefits for those who are unemployed to help them make ends meet, but that's not enough. We have to continue that until we stabilize the economy significantly and until unemployment falls. During this Congress, we've really helped our job creators: small businesses. We have to do more for them to make sure we steer equity and investment to start-ups in high-growth fields like clean energy and information technology, and we have to strengthen microlending from the Small Business Administration.

Look, we are not finished until millions of Americans who want to go to work go back to work. Our job isn't done until Americans achieve the American Dream.

#### HONORING IRA LEESFIELD

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Miami attorney Ira Leesfield on receiving the 2010 American Jewish Committee's Judge Learned Hand Award for Preferred Excellence.

The American Jewish Committee must have had Ira in mind when this prestigious award was created to honor the memory of Judge Learned Hand and the principles that he so well represented: individual rights and the importance of democratic values in an orderly society.

With his very strong professional background, outgoing personality and true compassion for our community, Ira Leesfield has been a strong voice for civil rights in south Florida for many years, and I am honored to count him as a friend.

As the senior and managing partner of Leesfield & Partners, P.A., Ira has received many other honors, including the Anti-Defamation League's Jurisprudence Award, and he was the first Florida recipient of the American ORT Jurisprudence Award.

I am pleased to join the American Jewish Committee, his family, friends, and neighbors in their celebration of Ira's countless contributions to our community and, indeed, to our Nation.

#### THE STATE OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, how soon we forget.

It's instructive to recall where we were 9 years ago. We had created 23

million new jobs; we were at peace throughout the world. In fact, we had a projected surplus of \$5.6 trillion. By this time, we would have paid off our debt. Instead, after 8 years of Republican control of all three branches of government, 8 years later, we had \$12 trillion of debt; we were engaged in two wars; health care costs were strangling our families and businesses. In fact, we were losing 700,000 jobs a month.

One year later, that job loss has been cut by 90 percent. We have a health care reform bill that will enable all American families to have affordable health care at less cost. The process of governance is difficult. To just say "no" is irresponsible.

#### GETTING THE AMERICAN ECONOMY BACK ON TRACK

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Massachusetts, Virginia, New Jersey—they have all spoken, and I think they speak for the American people.

They want us to try to work out these problems that they're facing together and not keep pointing fingers. It's time for us to get down to the job of creating jobs. They don't want this health care bill. It's pretty darn clear. That was the major issue in Massachusetts. So we need to get together and solve the problems of health care without ramming something down the people's throats from behind closed doors. It's extremely important.

They don't want higher taxes; they want lower taxes. They don't want more government interference in their lives; they want less. So what we ought to do is address the problems that are really important right now. The first thing is creating jobs and getting this economy back on track and not to try to ram a health care bill down the American people's throats that they really, really don't want.

#### SAVING AMERICA FROM AN ECONOMIC ABYSS

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, there is always a great deal of danger in spontaneous reactions to elections. One of the things that I thought about last night when I watched SCOTT BROWN accept his victory in Massachusetts was that he didn't talk about returning to the agenda of 2000–2008. He didn't talk about returning to Bush economics or the Republican agenda. As a matter of fact, he never mentioned the word "Republican."

What he did talk about, and he talked about it extremely well, was about the need for us to listen to the people, that the job wasn't his job or a Kennedy job. This was the people's job. It's a lesson for all of us to learn.

The true political victory will be won by the party and the individuals who

demonstrate responsiveness to the needs of their communities and of their citizens. We have been doing that now for a year. I think we can make a strong case on the Democratic side that we have saved this country from an economic abyss. We will continue to do that while we continue to listen to the people we work for.

#### TOP 10 LIST OF HEALTH REFORM BENEFITS WASHINGTON REPUBLICANS THREATEN TO STRIP AWAY

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, we need to get our courage up and continue to reform health care. There are tremendous benefits that will be lost if we don't clearly draw the path to health care reform.

What we are doing is providing protections against insurance companies' discrimination and against losing coverage when you get sick. Insurance security, if you lose your job, will be guaranteed. There will be relief for small businesses and employers. There will be jobs for Americans in the health care industry, no lifetime limits on coverage, and there will be free preventative care.

That is what we want to do for the American people. We must go out and clearly explain the benefits, each and every one of us, to the American people.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

#### PRIVATE FIRST CLASS GARFIELD M. LANGHORN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3250) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1210 West Main Street in Riverhead, New York, as the "Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3250

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. PRIVATE FIRST CLASS GARFIELD M. LANGHORN POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1210 West Main Street in Riverhead, New York,

shall be known and designated as the "Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

□ 1030

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House subcommittee with jurisdiction over the United States Postal Service, I am proud to present H.R. 3250 for consideration. This legislation will designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1210 West Main Street in Riverhead, New York, as the "Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn Post Office Building."

H.R. 3250 was introduced by my colleague and friend Representative TIM BISHOP of New York, on July 17, 2009, and was favorably reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee by unanimous consent on October 29, 2009. In addition, the legislation enjoys the support of the entire New York House delegation.

Born on September 10, 1948, in Cumberland, Virginia, Private First Class Garfield Langhorn distinguished himself through his brave, dedicated, and selfless military service during the Vietnam War as a member of the United States Army's Troop C, 7th Squadron, 17th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Aviation Brigade.

In recognition of his heroic actions during the Vietnam War, Private First Class Langhorn posthumously received the Medal of Honor, the highest military decoration awarded by the United States Government, as well as the Purple Heart. Private First Class Langhorn was one of 20 African American soldiers to receive the Medal of Honor for their service during the Vietnam War.

As noted by the citation accompanying his Medal of Honor, Private First Class Langhorn demonstrated "conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life and beyond the call of duty" while serving as a radio operator in Troop C in Vietnam's Pleiku province on January 15, 1969.

Specifically, the citation recounts that Private First Class Langhorn's

platoon had been inserted into a landing zone in order to rescue two pilots of a downed Cobra helicopter. While members of his platoon, who had found the two pilots dead, attempted to take the men's bodies to a nearby pickup location, Private First Class Langhorn provided radio coordination and covering fire as the platoon came under intense fire from enemy forces.

As darkness fell, an enemy hand grenade landed directly in front of Private First Class Langhorn and only a few feet from several wounded members of his platoon. In response, and without hesitation, Private First Class Langhorn threw himself on the grenade and absorbed the ensuing blast, thereby saving the lives of his comrades by sacrificing his own.

Accordingly, the Medal of Honor citation further notes that, "Private First Class Langhorn's extraordinary heroism, at the cost of his own life, was in keeping with the highest traditions of the military, and reflects great credit on himself, his unit, and the United States Army."

Mr. Speaker, in continued tribute to Private First Class Langhorn's bravery and self-sacrifice, the members of the United States Army's 7th Squadron, 17th Cavalry, past and present, have committed themselves to ensuring that his legacy and his memory lives on.

As noted by retired Sergeant Major Tony Morton, president of the 7th Squadron 17th Air Cavalry Association, all cavalry troopers assigned to the squadron must "earn their spurs" through the completion of a grueling 3-day series of tests and tasks known as the "spur ride." It is notable that completion of one of the stations requires soldiers to possess a detailed knowledge regarding the service and sacrifice of Private First Class Langhorn, a requirement that, according to Sergeant Major Morton, serves to ensure that Private First Class Langhorn "will go on in this squadron as long as this squadron is flying the colors."

In addition, in 2008, the squadron cut the ribbon on a conference center named after Private First Class Langhorn and the unit's other Medal of Honor recipient from Vietnam, Sergeant Ray McKibben. Moreover, the squadron also rededicated a memorial to the two soldiers that has been relocated from Fort Knox, Kentucky, to the unit's new headquarters at nearby Fort Campbell on the Kentucky-Tennessee border.

Mr. Speaker, the life of Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn stands as a testament to the lives of all those brave men and women who have served in the United States military and offered our Nation the ultimate sacrifice. Let us further honor the courageous soldiers through the passage of H.R. 3250, which designates the Riverhead, New York, Postal Service building in Private First Class Langhorn's name.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3250.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3250, designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1210 West Main Street in Riverhead, New York, as the "Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn Post Office Building."

Garfield M. Langhorn's selfless and heroic actions, for which he received the Congressional Medal of Honor, serve as an inspiration to all Americans.

On January 15, 1969, U.S. Army Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn of New York was serving as a radio operator in the Pleiku province of North Vietnam. His platoon's assignment was to rescue two helicopter pilots who had been shot down and were behind enemy lines. Langhorn coordinated with aircraft that were providing cover to his platoon during the rescue mission. While soldiers in the platoon were bringing the bodies of two helicopter pilots they were rescuing to an extraction site, well disguised North Vietnamese soldiers suddenly surrounded the platoon. Langhorn radioed the support aircraft for assistance and helped provide cover for the other soldiers in the platoon.

As night came, the fighting continued, but the air support could no longer accurately pinpoint the soldiers on the ground. The enemy soldiers continued to close in. An enemy soldier threw a hand grenade near Langhorn and wounded several of his colleagues and men. According to his Congressional Medal of Honor citation, "choosing to protect these wounded, he unhesitatingly threw himself on the grenade, scooped it beneath his body and absorbed the blast. By sacrificing himself, he saved the lives of his comrades."

Mr. Speaker, Garfield Langhorn was a true American hero. In his last dying words, he is reported to have said, "You have to care." Private First Class Langhorn did care deeply about his fellow soldiers and he cared about his country. His story is an inspiration to all Americans.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 3250 to honor Private First Class Langhorn's sacrifice for years to come.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's kind words.

I yield 3 minutes to the chief sponsor of this bill, Mr. BISHOP of New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking my friend Mr. LYNCH for his remarks with respect to this legislation. Let me also thank the gentleman from Illinois for his remarks and his support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as the proud sponsor of H.R. 3250, and I thank the leadership for calling up this bill to name the United States Post Office located at 1210 West Main Street in Riverhead, New York, in my district on Eastern Long Island, as the "Private First

Class Garfield M. Langhorn Post Office Building".

It was a journey of a hardworking American family, looking for an opportunity and a better way of life, that brought the family of Private First Class Garfield Langhorn of the United States Army from Cumberland, Virginia, to Riverhead, New York, in the early 1950s.

Private First Class Langhorn's mother still lives in this close-knit community—her name is Mary—where she raised her son who proudly answered the call of his country during the Vietnam War. He distinguished himself as a radio operator and as a good soldier. I am proud to represent Mrs. Langhorn, and I commend her for the grace and the dignity with which she carries her loss.

On a hillside in Pleiku province, Private First Class Langhorn heard an even higher call than service and duty. His ultimate sacrifice saved the lives of several of his fellow soldiers by selflessly absorbing the explosion of an enemy grenade within his own body. It was an act of valor and heroism for which the Medal of Honor was created, and for which it is solemnly reserved.

Today, the Medal of Honor retains pride of place on Mary Langhorn's wall as a tangible symbol of the respect and honor her son earned from the American people. Passing H.R. 3250 today affirms the pride of Riverhead by memorializing one of its most distinguished citizens.

As they conduct their business each day, the people of Riverhead who visit the post office will be reminded of PFC Langhorn's extraordinary service and sacrifice and can reflect on the true value of freedom. They will know that PFC Garfield M. Langhorn is a national hero, and the values for which he gave his life, honor, loyalty, and family will again forever be memorialized.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to all of my colleagues in the New York delegation for cosponsoring this legislation, and I again thank Chairman TOWNS, Mr. LYNCH, and the gentleman from Illinois for their support.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 3250.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I again, in closing, urge my colleagues to join the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) in honoring Private First Class Garfield Langhorn through the passage of H.R. 3250.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3250.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum

is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### CONGRATULATING NANCY GOODMAN BRINKER

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 708) congratulating Nancy Goodman Brinker for receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

##### H. RES. 708

Whereas Ambassador Brinker is the founder of the Susan G. Komen for the Cure, the world's leading breast cancer grass roots organization, and Ambassador Brinker established the organization in memory of her sister, who passed away from cancer in 1980;

Whereas through innovative events like Race for the Cure, the organization has given and invested nearly 1.5 billion for research, health services and education services since its founding in 1982;

Whereas the Susan G. Komen for the Cure has developed a worldwide grassroots network of breast cancer survivors and activists who are working together to save lives, empower people, ensure quality care for all and energize science to find cures;

Whereas Ambassador Brinker has served as Chair of the President's Cancer Panel (1990);

Whereas Ambassador Brinker has served as United States Ambassador to Hungary (2001–2003);

Whereas Ambassador Brinker has served as Chief of Protocol of the United States (2007–2009);

Whereas, in May of this year, Ambassador Brinker was named the first-ever World Health Organization's Goodwill Ambassador for Cancer Control;

Whereas, on July 30, 2009, President Obama named Peoria native Ambassador Nancy Goodman Brinker as a recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom;

Whereas the Presidential Medal of Freedom is America's highest civilian honor that is awarded to individuals who make an especially meritorious contribution to the security or national interests of the United States, world peace, cultural or other significant public or private endeavors;

Whereas Ambassador Brinker's public service has impacted millions of lives and her work, from promoting cancer research to promoting freedom around the world, and has been praised by members of both parties; and

Whereas President Obama will present Illinois native Ambassador Nancy Goodman Brinker with the Presidential Medal of Freedom on Wednesday, August 12, 2009: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives congratulates Nancy Goodman Brinker for receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am proud to present H. Res. 708 for consideration. This legislation expresses our congratulations to Ms. Nancy Goodman Brinker for receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

House Resolution 708 was introduced by my colleague and friend Representative AARON SCHOCK of Illinois on July 31, 2009, and was favorably reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee by voice vote on December 10, 2009. In addition, the legislation enjoys the support of nearly 60 Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, seeing that my colleague is the lead sponsor of this, I will reserve the balance of my time and allow the gentleman to offer this resolution.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my appreciation to my friend from Massachusetts. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we rise today to honor a great woman, a great leader, and, really, an icon in our country and around the world for what the power of one person, working with hundreds and thousands of others, but really one person's vision, tenacity, and hard work can mean for her fellow mankind on Earth.

We rise today to honor Nancy Goodman Brinker. She was born December 6, 1946, in Peoria, Illinois, and is most notably known for her work with the Susan G. Komen for the Cure Foundation, the world's leading breast cancer grassroots organization, which has impacted millions of lives.

This organization was established in memory of her sister, Susie Komen, who passed away from cancer in 1980. Ms. Brinker since then has also founded the Susan G. Komen for the Cure's signature program, the Race for the Cure, the largest series of 5-K run and fitness walks in the world.

Since its origin in 1983 in Dallas, Texas, the Race for the Cure series has grown from one local race with 800 participants to a national series of 112 races that yielded just over 1.5 million participants last year.

Ms. Brinker's contributions to society extend beyond her work with the Susan G. Komen centers. Ms. Brinker has served in the government as Chair of the President's Cancer Panel in the early 1990s. She then went as the U.S. Ambassador to Hungary from 2001 to 2003, and then as the Chief of Protocol for the United States from 2007 to 2009.

□ 1045

Time magazine in 2008 named her as one of the 100 most influential people in the entire world. In July, 2009, President Obama named Nancy Goodman Brinker as a recipient of the 2009 Presidential Medal of Freedom. The Presidential Medal of Freedom, of course, is America's highest civilian honor that is awarded to individuals who make an especially meritorious contribution to the security or national interest of the United States, world peace, cultural, or other significant public or private endeavors. She was presented the Presidential Medal of Freedom on Wednesday, August 12, 2009. The inscription on her Presidential Medal of Freedom says this: Drawing strength from tragedy, Nancy Goodman Brinker has transformed the Nation's approach to breast cancer.

When her sister was diagnosed in 1977, most breast cancer victims knew relatively little about the disease and suffered from popular stigmas. Nancy Brinker promised to challenge these norms. She founded Susan G. Komen for the Cure in honor of her sister. Today, the organization supports research and community awareness programs across the United States and around the world. Nancy Goodman Brinker's unique passion and determination have been a blessing to all those whose lives have been touched by breast cancer. In fact, it's these 1.5 million participants in the Race for the Cure and the thousands of people that this organization have touched that have led to the increased awareness of breast cancer. It's her work that has led to the infamous pastel pink being synonymous with breast cancer awareness and the work of the organization.

But let us be clear. The work has done much more than just create awareness about breast cancer research. Nancy Goodman Brinker's work has saved lives. In fact, the work of the Susan G. Komen Centers has generated over its 27 years \$1.5 billion in cancer research. As a result, we have discovered the first breast cancer susceptibility gene. The research dollars have led to the first use of magnetic resonance imaging scanners, or MRIs. They discovered the pathways that some cancer cells take in the body, leading to treatments to potentially stop the spread of cancers to other organs. And as a result of this continuous work, mortality from breast cancer is down. In the last decade, deaths from breast cancer fell by over 20 percent, and more than 2.5 million people in the United States are breast cancer survivors, the largest group of cancer survivors in America.

Now, as we read through the life and the work of Nancy Goodman Brinker, one might think this sounds like an obituary. But, my friends, rest assured Nancy Goodman Brinker's contributions to society are far from over. While many might retire, given this long resume of accomplishments, she continues to take on the mantle and

fight. Since her retirement from public service in our government, she has returned back as the CEO of the Susan G. Komen Centers and also was recently named the first ever World Health Organization's Goodwill Ambassador for Cancer Control.

Finally, I'd like to read a quote by our President, Barack Obama, when he issued the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Ms. Brinker. He said, One of the last things Susie Komen did before she passed away was ask her sister Nancy to make her a promise. Nancy promised her she would prevent other families battling breast cancer from hurting the way theirs had. What began with \$200 and a list of friends has become a global race for the cure, a campaign that has eased the pain and saved the lives of millions around the world. In the months after her sister's death, Nancy lay awake at night thinking about the promise she had made and wondering whether one person could really make a difference. Nancy's life is the answer.

Mr. Speaker, that is the reason we rise today to honor Nancy Goodman Brinker for what she has done, for what she continues to do, and for the inspiration that she is to all Americans of what one person can do for their country and for the world.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

As was noted, on August 12, 2009, President Obama awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, which is our Nation's highest civilian honor, to Ambassador Nancy Goodman Brinker in recognition of her efforts to advance breast cancer awareness and research. As noted by the President during the 2009 Medal of Freedom ceremony, the life of Nancy Goodman Brinker serves truly to answer the question whether one person can truly make a difference.

It is correct, as the gentleman from Illinois has noted, that this began as a promise between sisters. As she was falling victim to breast cancer, Susan G. Komen asked her beloved sister, Nancy, to promise to do everything she could to ensure that other families battling breast cancer had the help they needed to fight the deadly disease. From that simple promise between sisters, and in the honor of her sister, Ambassador Brinker has devoted her life to advancing breast cancer awareness and research.

In 1982, 2 years following her sister's passing, Ambassador Brinker, a breast cancer survivor herself, established Susan G. Komen for the Cure, a global nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting breast cancer research, a program that has affected millions of families in America. Notably, Susan G. Komen for the Cure, which also serves as the world's largest grassroots network of breast cancer survivors and activists, has raised nearly \$1.5 billion to support advancements in breast cancer research, education, and health services since its inception. From its advo-

cacy at the local, State, and Federal levels in support of enhanced breast cancer screening and treatment programs to its coordination with local health groups around the world to assist women in nearly 200 countries in overcoming social, cultural, and economic barriers to breast health treatment, Susan G. Komen for the Cure stands as a testament to the bravery of Susan G. Komen, as well as the commitment and vision of Ambassador Brinker.

As noted by Ambassador Brinker, Susan G. Komen for the Cure faced an immediate uphill battle in its mission to promote breast cancer awareness and research. In 1982, the disease received scant media attention and the fight against breast cancer was hampered by scarce resources, an inadequate supply network, and limited treatment options. However, under the dedicated and creative leadership of Ambassador Brinker, the breast cancer movement has managed to break the silence surrounding the disease and secure major advances with respect to breast cancer research, funding, education, and treatment.

In 1982, Ambassador Brinker founded the Susan G. Komen Race for the Cure, which is big in my district and is presently the world's largest and most successful education and fundraising event for breast cancer. In addition, Ambassador Brinker has also pioneered the concept of cause-related marketing, through which her foundation has established a variety of strong and enduring partnerships with businesses that share her commitment to ending breast cancer. Annually, the foundation raises over \$30 million through its marketing partnerships.

Moreover, Ambassador Brinker and her foundation have played an instrumental role in securing the passage of key legislation to promote public investment in breast health and breast cancer care. Most recently, the organization contributed to the passage of an amendment authored by Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI of Maryland to the Senate health care reform bill to ensure that breast cancer screening is available for women between the ages of 40 and 49. As noted by Ambassador Brinker, she will continue her efforts until the amendment becomes law.

In addition to her work on behalf of Susan G. Komen for the Cure, Ambassador Brinker's commitment to ending breast cancer can be witnessed through her service as Goodwill Ambassador For Cancer Control for the United Nations World Health Organization. In this capacity, Ambassador Brinker has sought to raise breast cancer awareness and strengthen treatment programs in impoverished nations as well as advocate in support of stronger global action for cancer prevention in accordance with the global strategy for the prevention and control of non-communicable diseases that was endorsed by the World Health Assembly in 2008.

Mr. Speaker, in light of Ambassador Brinker's tireless efforts on behalf of ending breast cancer and her distinguished public service, it is not surprising that she was named as one of our Nation's Presidential Medal of Freedom recipients for 2009. Let us congratulate Ambassador Brinker on her receipt of our Nation's highest civilian honor and commemorate her life's worth through the passage of H. Res. 708.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 708.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague and good friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, for his leadership on this crucial effort to eradicate breast cancer in our lifetime, and I rise in support of his resolution to congratulate Ambassador Nancy Goodman Brinker for receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Since her sister's death 30 years ago, Nancy has been devoted to finding a cure for breast cancer. As founder of the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation and the 5K Race for the Cure, Nancy has helped to raise almost a billion dollars for this noble effort. In my congressional district, the Miami-Fort Lauderdale Race for the Cure has raised more than \$4.5 million. Our yearly local events reach hundreds of thousands of people as an educational outreach tool and as a grassroots movement builder. The research grants from Nancy's foundation have contributed to many of the new treatments that have truly saved lives. Through efforts like hers, we have made important strides in increasing breast cancer awareness throughout our Nation.

Today, the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation is recognized as the leader in the fight against breast cancer. In solidarity with the countless survivors, like my good friend and Florida colleague, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I thank Ambassador Brinker for all that she has done and certainly all that she will continue to do in this noble fight against breast cancer.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague and good friend, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I do thank the gentleman from Illinois.

It is such an honor for me today to rise in strong support of the resolution to congratulate Ambassador Nancy Brinker for receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom. Ambassador Brinker founded Susan G. Komen for the Cure in 1982, and has since built it into the world's leading breast cancer grassroots organization. The Susan G. Komen Foundation awarded \$780,000 in research grants in 2008 in my home



State of Tennessee, and we are grateful for those grants.

Through her advocacy efforts, Ambassador Brinker is to be commended for saving countless lives as a trailblazer fighting for the health of women worldwide, empowering patients, and raising billions in funding for continued breast cancer research. She has worked tirelessly, building an impressive resume of accomplishments, most recently being named the first ever World Health Organization's Goodwill Ambassador for Cancer Control.

I commend Ambassador Brinker for standing with all women to raise awareness on the issue of mammography rationing in the health care reform bill and continuing to advocate for increased access to appropriate therapies and screenings for all Americans. Her contributions to society deserve much praise, and each points back to her original goal: to ease suffering and raise awareness to eradicate breast cancer for all, and to honor the memory of her sister. Today, we honor her.

□ 1100

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, with that, I urge all Members to support the passage of House Resolution 708, honoring one of the finest Americans, Nancy Goodman Brinker.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in closing, again I urge my colleagues to join Mr. SCHOCK of Illinois in congratulating Ms. Nancy Goodman Brinker on receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom through the passage of H. Res. 708.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 708, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONGRESSWOMAN JAN MEYERS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4095) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9727 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the "Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4095

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. CONGRESSWOMAN JAN MEYERS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9727

Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, shall be known and designated as the "Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As chairman of the House subcommittee with jurisdiction over the United States Postal Service, I am pleased to present H.R. 4095 for consideration. This legislation will designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 9727 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the "Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building." Introduced by my friend and colleague Representative DENNIS MOORE of Kansas on November 17, 2009, H.R. 4095 was reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on December 10, 2009, by voice vote. Notably, H.R. 4095 has the support of the entire Kansas House delegation.

Since the lead sponsor, Mr. MOORE, is here, I would like to yield him such time as he may consume in bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to rise in support of bipartisan legislation which I introduced with my colleagues in the Kansas congressional delegation, H.R. 4095, designating the post office located at 9727 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the "Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building."

Jan Meyers was elected to represent the Third Congressional District of Kansas in 1984 and reelected in five subsequent elections. In 1995, she became the first Republican woman to chair a standing House committee, the Small Business Committee, in more than 40 years. That milestone capped Jan's long tenure as a public servant that began with 5 years of service on the Overland Park City Council and included 12 years in the State senate. As Congressional Quarterly described her, Jan was "a mild mannered social moderate known for her willingness to compromise . . . Meyers' middle ground instincts make her a case swing vote."

Janice Lenore Crilly, Jan, was born on July 20, 1928, in Lincoln, Nebraska,

the daughter of Howard M. Crilly, a newspaper publisher, and Lenore N. Crilly. Jan and her brother Donn were raised in Superior, Nebraska. In 1948, she graduated with an associate fine arts degree from William Woods College in Fulton, Missouri, and with a B.A. in communications from the University of Nebraska in 1951. Following graduation, she worked in advertising and public relations.

Jan Crilly married Louis "Dutch" Meyers who eventually became a Kansas City television station executive, and they raised a daughter and son, Valerie and Philip. Jan's career in Kansas GOP politics began in 1966 when she served as Overland Park chairwoman for Larry Winn, Jr.'s campaign for the Third Congressional District U.S. House seat. Two years later, she was the district co-Chair for the first of Senator Robert Dole's string of five successful Senate races. In 1974, Jan chaired Republican BOB BENNETT's gubernatorial campaign in Johnson County.

From 1967 to 1972, she served as a member of the Overland Park City Council, presiding for 2 years. In 1972, Jan won election of the Kansas State Senate and served there for the next 12 years, rising to chair the Public Health and Welfare Committee as well as the Local Government Committee. When Representative Winn retired in 1984, Jan entered the GOP primary to succeed him. By that point, the district was a narrow north/south sliver, nestled in the northeast corner of Kansas across the river from the metropolis of Kansas City, Missouri. In a five-way race, she won the party nomination; and in the general election, she faced a formidable opponent in the Democratic candidate, Kansas City Mayor Jack Reardon.

Jan emphasized her long experience in State politics and campaigned around the district. When Congresswoman Meyers arrived in the House after winning that race, she was appointed to the Committee on Science and Technology, the Committee on Small Business, and the Select Committee on Aging. In the 100th Congress, she transferred from Science and Technology to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Jan was most active on the Small Business Committee where she introduced a number of legislative measures to protect small business interests and to ensure they had fair representation in government. She worked to bring permanent tax cuts for small business. When Republicans took control of the House in the 1994 elections, Jan Meyers was promoted to chair the Small Business Committee. It marked the first time that a Republican woman had chaired the House committee since Edith Nourse Rogers headed Veterans' Affairs in the 83rd Congress from 1953 to 1955.

"Leadership positions come as a result of seniority," Jan said. And later she said, "I sincerely hope that women



continue to run and continue to get elected, and I think that will ultimately result in more women being elected to leadership positions." Jan declined to run for reelection in 1996, noting that she wanted to spend more time with her family. "There are other things in life I want to do, and being a Member of Congress, if you take the job seriously, simply does not leave time," Jan told the press. She also said she believed that Members of Congress should serve no more than 10 to 14 years.

Jan returned to Overland Park, Kansas, where she joined foundation boards for a local library and a community college.

Mr. Speaker, Jan Meyers was a valued and important Member of Congress during her tenure in this body, and it is fitting that we vote today to name on her behalf a post office in the city she served as a commissioner. This is bipartisan. I ask for the support of my colleagues.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4095, which would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service, located at 9727 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building. Congresswoman Meyers dedicated her career to serving the people of Kansas.

After working on Larry Winn's successful campaign for a Kansas City-based House seat in 1966, Meyers began her own career in public service as a member of the Overland Park City Council from 1967 until 1972. In 1972, Meyers won a seat in the Kansas State Senate. She would serve in the State senate for 12 years, eventually becoming the Chair of the Public Health and Welfare Committee. In 1984, Congressman Larry Winn decided to retire. Meyers won the election for the district's open seat. She served her constituents for five terms, during which time she became the Chair of the Small Business Committee. She was the first woman in almost 20 years to chair a Permanent House committee.

Small businesses were very important to her throughout her career. She once commented, "There may be more dramatic issues, but none that are more important . . . because the small business sector employs at least 50 percent, maybe a little more, of the individuals in this country. Virtually all of the entry-level employees are with small business." A quote that is relevant to today.

While some wanted to eliminate the Small Business Committee at the time, Congresswoman Meyers was committed to seeing the committee was active and served an important purpose. In 1995, Congresswoman Meyers decided that she would retire and not run for reelection in order to spend more time with her family. She considered bills that she introduced that lowered taxes and reduced regulation on small business

owners as some of the greatest accomplishments in her career.

Throughout her five terms of service, Congresswoman Meyers believed that it was very important to "listen to your conscience and your constituents, both. Most of the time, they'll agree."

Mr. Speaker, to honor Congresswoman Meyers' career of service and the work that she did both for her constituents in Kansas and for small business owners throughout America, I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time; however, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the great State of Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman from Illinois for recognizing me today.

I am here today to honor former Kansas Congresswoman Jan Meyers, a fiscal conservative and a true public servant. Jan served in the House of Representatives from 1985 to 1997, representing the communities around Kansas City. In 1995, she became the first woman chairman of a House committee since 1976.

Before her election to Congress, she served on the Overland Park City Council and as a senator in the Kansas State Legislature. While serving Kansans in the House of Representatives, Jan was a consistent advocate for fiscal responsibility, an example that many in Washington today could follow. Whether she was promoting legislation in the Small Business Committee to protect small business owners or offering conservative solutions during the debate over welfare reform, she always remembered that when Congress spent money, it was the taxpayers' money, not the government's.

She regularly voted to cut taxes so that Americans could keep more of what they earned and worked to reduce the budget deficit and eliminate wasteful government spending. Kansas son and American hero Bob Dole summed it up well when he said of Jan Meyers on the Senate floor that she "never stopped fighting to reduce the regulatory and tax burdens on America's small businessmen and women." She was a true steward of the people's resources and worked hard on their behalf.

Yet it was her caring and attentive nature that Kansans really remember. Although a conservative Republican, Jan reached out to Kansans of every philosophy. She was sensitive to the needs of Kansans and always quick to respond to their problems. Jan never forgot who she worked for and always had time for the folks back home.

To me, Jan was more than an ideal public servant. She is also a friend. The manner in which she met difficult circumstances with a smile gave me com-

fort on several occasions, and I value her kindness and gentle spirit. While we recognize Jan today, it's also important to note the recent loss of Jan's husband of 56 years, Dutch. Together, Jan and Dutch made a good team and raised two wonderful children.

Our Nation needs more public servants like Jan Meyers, people that are good stewards of taxpayer money and put service above self. Designating a post office in her hometown of Overland Park in her name will remind Kansans of these characteristics and honor her legacy for years to come. I thank Jan Meyers for a job well done and for a life well lived.

I appreciate the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I urge support and passage of H.R. 4095, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to rise in support of bipartisan legislation I introduced with my colleagues in the Kansas congressional delegation, H.R. 4095, designating the post office located at 9727 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the "Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building".

Jan Meyers was elected to represent the Third Congressional District of Kansas in 1984, and re-elected in five subsequent elections. In 1995, she became the first Republican woman to chair a standing House committee, the Small Business Committee, in more than 40 years. That milestone capped Jan's long tenure as a public servant that began with 5 years of service on the Overland Park City Council and included twelve years in the state senate. As Congressional Quarterly described her, Jan was "a mild mannered social moderate known for her willingness to compromise. . . . Meyers' middle ground instincts make her a key swing vote."

Janice Lenore Crilly (Jan) was born on July 20, 1928, in Lincoln, Nebraska, the daughter of Howard M. Crilly, a newspaper publisher, and Lenore N. (Hazel) Crilly. Janice Crilly and her brother, Donn, were raised in Superior, Nebraska. In 1948, she graduated with an Associate Fine Arts degree from William Woods College in Fulton, Missouri, and with a B.A. in communications from the University of Nebraska in 1951. Following graduation, she worked in advertising and public relations. Jan Crilly married Louis "Dutch" Meyers, who eventually became a Kansas City television station executive, and they raised a daughter and son, Valerie and Philip.

Jan Meyers's career in Kansas GOP politics began in 1966, when she served as Overland Park chairwoman for Larry Winn, Jr.'s campaign for the Third District U.S. House seat. Two years later, she was district co-chair for the first of Senator Robert Dole's string of five successful Senate races. In 1974, Jan chaired Republican Bob Bennett's gubernatorial campaign in Johnson County. From 1967 to 1972, she served as a member of the Overland Park City Council, presiding for two years. In 1972, Meyers won election to the Kansas state senate and served there for the next 12 years, rising to chair the public health and welfare committee as well as the local government committee.

When Representative Winn retired in 1984, Jan entered the GOP primary to succeed him. By that point, the district was a narrow north-south sliver nestled in the northeast corner of Kansas across the river from the metropolis of Kansas City, Missouri. In a five-way race she won the party nomination. In the general election she faced a formidable opponent in the Democratic candidate, Kansas City Mayor Jack Reardon. Jan emphasized her long experience in state politics and plastered the district with "Jan Can" posters. Benefiting from being on a ticket that featured President Reagan and the popular Senator Nancy Kassebaum (who received more votes than Reagan in the November elections), Jan won.

When Congresswoman Meyers arrived in the House, she was appointed to the Committee on Science and Technology, the Committee on Small Business, and the Select Committee on Aging. In the 100th Congress (1987–1989), she transferred from Science and Technology to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Jan was most active on the Small Business Committee. She introduced a number of legislative measures to protect small business interests and to ensure that they had fair representation in government. She worked to bring permanent tax cuts for small businesses.

When Republicans took control of the House in the 1994 elections, Jan Meyers was promoted to chair of the Small Business Committee. It marked the first time that a Republican woman had chaired a House committee since Edith Nourse Rogers headed Veterans' Affairs in the 83rd Congress (1953–1955). "Leadership positions come as a result of seniority," Jan said later. "I sincerely hope that women continue to run and continue to get elected, and I think that will ultimately result in more women being elected to leadership positions."

Jan declined to run for re-election in 1996, noting that she wanted to spend more time with her family. "There are other things in life I want to do, and being a Member of Congress, if you take the job seriously, simply does not leave time," Jan told the press. She also said she believed that Members of Congress should serve no more than 10 to 14 years. Meyers returned to Overland Park, Kansas, where she joined foundation boards for a local library and a community college.

Mr. Speaker, Jan Meyers was a valued and important member of Congress during her tenure in this body and it is fitting that we vote today to name on her behalf a post office in the city she served as a commissioner.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to voice my support for H.R. 4095, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9727 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the "Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building".

I would like to also congratulate my colleague and fellow Kansan, Mr. MOORE, the sponsor of this bill, for his service to our state. And thank Mr. MORAN and Mr. TIAHRT, the other members of the Kansas delegation who joined me as the original co-sponsors of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, We Kansans are proud of our pioneering spirit and Congresswoman Jan Meyers is a great example of that spirit. Born in Lincoln, Nebraska, Jan attended public schools in Superior, Nebraska before receiving

a bachelor of arts from the University of Nebraska in 1951.

After moving to Kansas, Jan served on the City Council of Overland Park, from 1967 to 1972. She then served in the Kansas Senate from 1972 to 1984 and in 1984 she was elected to the House of Representatives where she served until January 3, 1997. During her time in this body, Jan chaired the Committee on Small Business in the 104th Congress, the first woman to serve in that capacity in more than 20 years.

Jan's commitment to fiscal responsibility made her a regular recipient of the Golden Bulldog Award from Watchdog of the Treasury for her work to eliminate wasteful in government spending she was regularly named Taxpayer Hero by the Citizens Against Government Waste.

Jan is also an advocate for children and was a leader for health care reform. A committed conservationist, Jan was essential in the creation of the Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve, 10,894 acres of protected Kansas tall grass prairie, which forms the only unit of the National Park System dedicated to the rich natural and cultural history of this cherished ecosystem that is in our state.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, Jan Meyers is a great Kansan who served our State and this Nation with distinction and I consider myself lucky to call her my friend.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, again I encourage my friends on both sides of the aisle to join Mr. MOORE of Kansas in honoring the life and legacy of Congresswoman Jan Meyers through the passage of H.R. 4095, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4095.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EARLY DETECTION MONTH FOR BREAST CANCER

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 158) expressing support for the designation of an Early Detection Month for breast cancer and all forms of cancer, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

##### H. CON. RES. 158

Whereas in 2009, 1,479,350 new cases of cancer will be diagnosed in the United States;

Whereas the most common types of cancer in the United States are nonmelanoma skin cancer, breast cancer in women, prostate cancer in men, lung cancer, and colorectal cancers;

Whereas one out of every eight women in the United States will develop breast cancer in her lifetime;

Whereas incidence of breast cancer in young women is much lower than in older women, and young women's breast cancers

are generally more aggressive and result in lower survival rates;

Whereas breast cancer currently takes the life of one woman in the United States every 13 minutes;

Whereas in 2009, 192,370 women in the United States will be diagnosed with invasive breast cancer;

Whereas there is currently no known cure for metastatic breast cancer;

Whereas many oncologists and breast cancer researchers believe that a cure for breast cancer will not be discovered until well into the future, if such a cure is possible at all;

Whereas prostate cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death among men, with over 80 percent of all cases occurring in men over age 65;

Whereas African-American men are diagnosed with the disease at later stages and die of prostate cancer more often than do white men;

Whereas in 2009, 1,910 men in the United States will be diagnosed with invasive breast cancer;

Whereas if detected early enough, over three-quarters of those who develop cancer could be saved;

Whereas greater annual awareness of the critical necessity of the early detection of breast cancer and other cancers will not only save tens of thousands of lives but also greatly reduce the financial strain on government and private health care services by detecting cancer before it requires very expensive medical treatment and protocols;

Whereas there is a need for enhanced public awareness of cancer screening; and

Whereas the designation of an Early Detection Month will enhance public awareness of breast cancer and all other forms of cancer: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress supports the designation of an Early Detection Month to enhance public awareness of screening for breast cancer and all other forms of cancer.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am proud to present House Concurrent Resolution 158 for consideration. This resolution expresses support for the designation of an Early Detection Month for breast cancer and all forms of cancer.

□ 1115

House Concurrent Resolution 158 was introduced by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), on June 25, 2009, and was favorably reported out of the House Oversight Committee by voice

vote on December 12, 2009. In addition, the legislation enjoys the support of more than 50 Members of Congress.

In recognition of Mr. ETHERIDGE's sponsorship, I would like to recognize him and yield him such time as he may consume.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in support of this resolution expressing the support for the designation of an Early Detection Month for cancer. I would also like to thank Chairman TOWNS for his work in bringing this bill to the floor.

Every year almost 2 million Americans are diagnosed with cancer. Tragically, more than one-quarter of those cases result in death. Early detection can help patients get early treatment. It can stop the spread of the disease before it becomes untreatable, or before it requires expensive medical treatments, and can be the difference between life and death. Early detection saves tens of thousands of lives annually, and also greatly reduces the financial strain on government and private health care services.

Several years ago, I was diagnosed with melanoma. My cancer was found early because I see my doctor regularly. Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who joins me in sponsoring this resolution, found hers early because she was aware of how to test for the early signs of cancer. As cancer survivors ourselves, we want to enable all Americans to have the knowledge and access to care that can lead to early detection.

This resolution expresses support for an Early Detection Month beginning in May 2010. This concurrent resolution enhances public awareness of cancer screening and early detection so that any person who gets cancer can have a chance to survive.

Mr. Speaker, early detection is critical to help reduce the tragedy of cancer deaths in our country. I urge my colleagues to join me in fighting a disease that has claimed so many lives but, with support for early detection, can be beaten.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 158, which expresses support for the designation of an Early Detection Month for breast cancer and all forms of cancers. Each year in the United States, there are over 1.4 million new cases of cancer, and hundreds of thousands of Americans die from this dreaded disease. Most of us know a family member, a friend, or a colleague who has been diagnosed with cancer and who has died from a struggle with cancer. Inevitably, cancer will affect every one of us in some way.

While early detection of cancer does not make every case treatable, early detection can dramatically increase the chance of survival. The American Cancer Society reports that the rate of death from breast cancer has been de-

clining since 1990 largely because of the increased rate of early detection.

The American Cancer Society has similar conclusions for the declining mortality rate among men diagnosed with prostate cancer. Early detection is essential to helping to treat cancer and save thousands of lives every year.

Unfortunately, despite the benefits of early detection, many Americans do not get the yearly examinations from their doctors that could detect various forms of cancers. The American Cancer Society reports that only 51 percent of all women 40 years and older had a mammogram in the last year. Less than half of all men age 50 and older were screened for prostate cancer in the last year. Nearly half of all Americans who are in the age groups most vulnerable for these types of cancers are not getting the early detection tests that could save their lives.

Mr. Speaker, we need to encourage more Americans to get early cancer detection tests such as mammograms and prostate screenings. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this resolution which will create an Early Detection Month and raise public awareness of early detection of cancer to encourage more Americans to get life-saving, early detection tests.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak in support of this, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlemen from Illinois and North Carolina, and I want to drill down some of the numbers that have been offered by the American Cancer Society.

They report that in 2009, 1.5 million new cases of cancer were diagnosed in the United States alone. In addition, the American Cancer Society notes that roughly one out of every two American men and one out of every three American women will have some type of cancer at some point in their lifetime. They also report that the most common types of cancer in the United States are nonmelanoma skin cancer, breast cancer in women, and prostate cancer in men. One out of every eight women in the United States will develop breast cancer, and about one in six men will be diagnosed with prostate cancer.

Furthermore, the American Cancer Society estimates that in 2009, more than 560,000 Americans died of cancer. In other words, more than 1,500 people lost their lives to cancer every day last year. The American Cancer Society also notes that cancer accounts for nearly one out of every four deaths in the United States, which makes cancer the second most common cause of death in the United States, exceeded only by heart disease.

Now, despite these troubling statistics, with early detection and proper management, cancer can be highly treatable. As noted by the American Cancer Society, the 5-year relative survival rate for all cancers diagnosed between 1996 and 2004 is about 66 percent,

up from 50 percent in 1975 to 1977. The 5-year relative survival for female breast cancer has improved from 63 percent in the early 1960s to 89 percent today. Additionally, over the past 25 years, the 5-year survival rate for prostate cancer has increased from 69 percent to almost 99 percent.

Now, cancer can strike any individual regardless of gender, race, or age; but still, it is important to note that the risk of being diagnosed with cancer increases with age. In fact, according to the American Cancer Society, 77 percent of all cancers are diagnosed in persons 55 years and older.

Mr. Speaker, greater awareness of the critical necessity of breast cancer, prostate cancer, and all other cancers will save tens of thousands of lives, and may also help decrease the financial strain on government and private health care services by detecting cancer before it requires costly medical treatment.

Accordingly, let us take this opportunity through passage of H. Con. Res. 158 to increase public awareness of breast cancer and all forms and types of cancer and encourage all Americans to work with their doctors in order to maximize the possibility of early detection.

I urge my colleagues to join Mr. ETHERIDGE in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 158.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for the time.

I rise in support of this resolution for the designation of an Early Detection Month for breast cancer. I do so in solidarity with and through the strength of thousands of breast cancer survivors.

Almost everyone in this country, unfortunately, knows someone who has suffered from breast cancer. Breast cancer is the second most common cancer among women, but it is becoming one of the most survivable cancers if the disease is detected early, which is the purpose of the bill before us.

We must remain vigilant in our efforts to educate and diagnose and treat. With these three pillars—education, diagnosis and treatment—we can and we will save lives. Let us make sure that we educate one another on the dangers of breast cancer and the need for early and routine checkups. Early detection makes the difference in surviving this terrible disease.

In memory of Congresswoman JoAnn Davis, who passed away at the age of 57 while serving last Congress after a 2-year battle with breast cancer, and for my baby granddaughter, Morgan Elizabeth, let us make sure that our efforts to defeat this terrible disease continue with the same strength, and even stronger, in our efforts at early detection for all individuals in our country and, indeed, the world.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I believe that probably everybody in the House and in the Senate has someone that they know or knew that had breast cancer or another form of cancer.

My first wife, Barbara, died about 8 years ago from cancer. I will never forget the day she felt a lump in her breast. She thought it was a fibrous tissue. She had them before, and she didn't want to go have herself tested. I said, I want you to go to the doctor and have him look at that. She did, and she called me a couple of days later when I was out here in Washington and she started crying and said, I've got breast cancer. Of course, I went back home and we went to the doctor and went through all of the things that you have to go through, including the chemotherapy. For any family that has gone through that, they know how very difficult it is. Had she had a mammogram earlier, she might not have had the breast cancer metastasize and go to other parts of her body. She ultimately passed away. It was a tragic thing to watch that.

That is why this bill, although it may sound like just a resolution, is very, very important. One of the things in the health care negotiations that has concerned me a great deal is that there was some talk about limiting mammograms to people 50 and above, and the people between 40 and 50 might not be included in getting mammograms and having coverage for that, either under the health plan or insurance plans.

I want to read you a letter from a young lady from my district in Noblesville, Indiana, Tonya Lewis. Here is what she says: "I was diagnosed with triple negative breast cancer in May of 2008 at age 39. I found this lump myself. I had a baseline mammogram at age 35. It came back clear. I was advised not to have another mammogram until age 40. The radiologist that read my mammogram at age 39 advised me that if I would have had a mammogram at age 36, 37, or 38, most likely I would not have had to have a mastectomy and 14 lymph nodes removed. My cancer spread to my lungs and chest wall after doing chemo and radiation. After completing nine different types of chemo, as of November 24, 2009, I am finally cancer free. Please fight for us breast cancer survivors and the young women in the future. I believe mammograms should be available and paid for by insurance companies at any age."

When we talk about limiting breast cancer screening to people 50 and above, I think we make a mistake because breast cancer does kill. One in every eight women is going to get breast cancer in their lifetime and it is going to affect families across this country. I think we ought to make sure

that we don't start limiting mammograms to only people 50 and above. It has been 40 and above for some time. In this particular case it wouldn't have helped her because she was in her thirties when she developed breast cancer. It is a very, very serious thing, and unless somebody has lived with it, they don't understand how horrible it is to watch somebody pass away going through the travails of cancer.

So I want to congratulate my colleagues on sponsoring this bill, and I hope in the negotiations on the health care bill, regardless of how it comes out, we make sure that we take care of the women who are suffering from these things and catch it before it becomes terminal.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of House Concurrent Resolution 158, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 158, a resolution expressing support for the designation of an Early Detection Month for breast cancer and all forms of cancer.

Breast cancer in women is one of the most frequent forms of cancer recognized in the more than 2 million new cases of cancer diagnosed each year in the United States. In fact, every 13 minutes a woman dies from breast cancer, and in 2009 alone, 192,370 women were diagnosed with breast cancer in the U.S. This resolution recognizes the importance of early detection for breast cancer victims and is paramount due to the deadly nature of the disease.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Preventative Services Task Force recommendations—against routine mammography for women ages 40 to 49 and breast self-examinations—were shocking to say the least. As a practicing OB/GYN physician for nearly 30 years, I saw first hand the benefits that early detection of cancer in women can have on saving lives and improving quality of life. Therefore, it is imperative that this House duly recognizes the significance of self-examination and early detection of breast cancer.

The designation of Early Detection Month will enhance public awareness of the catastrophic and devastating effects of cancer. Hopefully, this resolution will shine further light on a disease that so commonly affects millions of Americans and in turn help to promote research and advanced medical procedures that will one day lead to a cure.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, again I encourage my friends on both sides of the aisle to join Mr. ETHERIDGE in supporting the designation of an Early Detection Month for breast cancer and all forms of cancers through the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 158.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent

resolution, H. Con. Res. 158, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1130

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3254, TAOS PUEBLO INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT; FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3342, AAMODT LITIGATION SETTLEMENT ACT; AND FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1065, WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2009

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1017 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1017

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3254) to approve the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Agreement, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative McClintock of California or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3342) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, to develop water infrastructure in the Rio Grande Basin, and to approve the settlement of the water rights claims of the Pueblos of Nambe, Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, and Tesuque. All points of order against consideration of the

bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative McClintock of California or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1065) to resolve water rights claims of the White Mountain Apache Tribe in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the further amendment printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative McClintock of California or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Diaz-Balart). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1017.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1017 is a single rule that provides for separate consideration of three measures dealing with water rights settlements. Each bill is to be considered under a structured amendment process.

The rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 3254, the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Act; H.R. 3342, the Aamodt Litigation Settlement Act; and H.R. 1065, the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2009. Each bill has 1 hour of general debate, to be controlled by the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule for H.R. 1065 self-executes an amendment to ensure that the bill is PAYGO compliant. Each bill allows for the consideration of a separate amendment by Representative MCCLINTOCK, which is debatable for 10 minutes. The rule also allows a motion to recommit, with or without instructions, for each of the three bills.

H.R. 1065, the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2009; H.R. 3254, the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Act; and H.R. 3342, the Aamodt Litigation Settlement Act are all bipartisan pieces of legislation, and they are all sensible pieces of legislation. Each of these bills will approve, ratify, and confirm carefully negotiated settlement agreements between tribal representatives, non-Indian water users, and the United States Government.

These agreements will provide both the tribes involved and affected communities in Arizona and New Mexico proper access to clean water. These three bills will provide critical funding for the development of drinking water supplies for people who have been hauling their water for years in the back of their pickup trucks. We know how critical clean drinking water is for the human body's health and development. These bills will improve the health of young Native Americans by providing clean drinking water, and certainty to non-Indian people that the water will be available to them for development and use.

H.R. 1065 provides the required congressional approval for the agreement between the White Mountain Apache tribe and water users throughout Arizona. This legislation boasts the support of the entire bipartisan Arizona delegation.

H.R. 3254 and H.R. 3342 each approve water settlement agreements in New Mexico considered critical to clean water access to the Taos Valley and Rio Grande watershed. Both of these bills were favorably reported by voice vote out of the Natural Resources Committee.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it has taken decades to work out these settlements. Congress has a responsibility to approve these settlements now and provide clean drinking water access for the affected tribes and the non-Indian people, and for their generations to

come. I believe it is time for Congress to move on these bills, and I am pleased that Chairman RAHALL and the Natural Resources Committee has worked in a bipartisan way to move these bills through the process.

Now, there is some concern on the other side of the aisle that the Justice Department has not commented formally on any of these bills. Our colleague from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) believes the Department of Justice should formally respond to each of these bills before they take effect. The gentleman from California has legitimate concerns, and these concerns deserve to be considered on the floor today, and that is why we made this amendment in order on each of these bills.

This is a good rule. I urge my colleagues to support it today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Over the next 2 days, the House is set to consider three separate bills that would approve and ratify tribal claims to water rights made by the White Mountain Apache tribe in Arizona and the Pueblos of Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, Tesuque, and Taos in New Mexico. The bills would also restore and protect some environmentally sensitive land and watersheds, and require the maintenance of the water systems in question until they are conveyed to the respective tribes.

I support these bills when the McClintock amendments are included because I believe that the settlements will bring long-term certainty and stability to the respective tribes and water users in the affected areas.

Mr. Speaker, last night the majority in the Rules Committee decided to allow for consideration all three of the amendments submitted to the three bills we are set to consider this week. I wish to thank them for their uncharacteristic generosity in allowing minority amendments. These important amendments would prevent the bill from taking effect until the Attorney General assures Congress in writing that the settlements in these bills would represent a net benefit to the U.S. taxpayer based on the costs and risks of litigation and the odds the tribes would prevail in the litigation. I believe these amendments are important because they require the Attorney General to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the settlements and make sure that they are fiscally responsible before the settlement funds can be paid.

Now, I assume that the other side of the aisle will highlight that this rule allows debate on all of the amendments which were submitted to the Rules Committee, but it restricts any and all possible further amendments from consideration. It is not an open rule. The majority campaigned on a promise to allow open and bipartisan debates in

Congress, yet this year they have yet to allow even one open rule. That is correct, not one open rule. And that, Mr. Speaker, includes even the traditionally open appropriations process.

They could have changed that glaring and unfortunate statistic by allowing an open rule on the underlying, uncontroversial bill, but the majority in the Rules Committee decided to continue to make this the most closed Congress in history.

Now, let's look at the possible reasons the majority on the Rules Committee decided to vote against an open rule for these bills. Could it be that there is not enough time on the House schedule this week? Well, the House, until last night, was scheduled to be in session until Friday. And this rule, as proposed, only allows for a total of 3½ hours of total debate time for all three bills and all three amendments.

Even though we are now scheduled to leave on Thursday, we still have more than enough time to complete the three bills with an open rule. I sincerely doubt that an open rule would garner more than a handful of amendments. It would allow the majority to say for the first time, and to prove, at least offer some evidence, that they are living up to their pledge to run an open Congress.

I believe the real reason is that the majority is afraid of an open debate even on uncontroversial bills, and so they restrict debate consistently. It has become their standard operating procedure to close debate in the House. It is unfortunate, but it is a fact.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate how well my colleague on the Rules Committee adheres to the Republican talking points, but I will again reiterate that all the amendments that were brought to the Rules Committee last night were made in order. And I think this is a good rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Well, it is not a question of talking points, it is a question of fact. We will move on.

I at this point yield, Mr. Speaker, 5 minutes, to my distinguished friend from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida. I appreciate the opportunity.

My simple resolution requires that all negotiations on the health care bill be conducted under the watchful eye of the American people. The American people are angry, and for good reason. Washington is not listening.

□ 1145

Last night I think is a perfect example: It's not about Democrat and Republican, it's about the American people wanting to have more input into the process.

Even worse, Washington is not even letting the American people into the room to discuss or hear the health care reform debate. Secret deals, backroom

deals on the health care bill should not be tolerated. In the State of Florida, we have the toughest sunshine laws in the country. You can't have two city commissioners, two county commissioners, two State senators—no one can go in the back room together and cut a deal or a secret deal and then lay that on the American people. We want to bring that sunshine to Washington. I am pleased that we have over 165 Members that have joined me in this cause and cosponsored this bill, this resolution, Democrats and Republicans.

Also, I introduced, and we have 111 Members that have signed, a discharge petition to force a vote on the floor. We want to get a vote to the floor on this sunshine resolution, and we feel confident that we're going to be able to do that.

C-SPAN has offered to publicly broadcast the health care meetings, and congressional leaders should accept that opportunity. Even the President said during the campaign eight different times that he wants this to be the most open, transparent administration in history. He said eight different times he wanted C-SPAN in the room. C-SPAN has agreed to be in the room during these negotiations. I don't want to, as a Member of Congress, end up with a 3,000-page bill at the end of the day that nobody has had a chance to read and you've got a day or so to look at it.

I think there is a good reason why Speaker PELOSI doesn't want the negotiations in public, because basically it's a bad bill. In my area of Sarasota-Bradenton, Florida, we have the most seniors, almost 300,000 in our district, more than any other district in the country. They want to cut Medicare \$500 billion. I've seen the cuts. They're very real. They want to raise taxes on small business.

I know the biggest issue we've got is the economy and jobs. Working families want to get back to work, but yet they want to charge 8 percent on payroll. I've been in business for 30 years; I'm not a career politician. I can tell you that will kill more jobs than anything. That's a fixed expense, 8 percent on payroll.

They want to charge another 5.4 percent tax on businesses. Most businesses have pass-through income, whether they're a Sub S or LLC or a partnership, or whatever kind of business. They want to raise the taxes from 34, let Bush's tax cut sunset, which will take it to 39, then another 5.4, which will take it 45 percent in Florida. In many States like California that have a State income tax, or Oregon or New York, of 10 or 15 percent, it could take it up as high as 60 percent. So these small businesses have a lot of pass-through income. They're not going to have the capital. They're going to be sending the money here. That's going to cut more jobs.

It's time to bring some sunshine to Washington that we've got in Florida.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, aside from the fact that the gentleman's

comments have absolutely nothing to do with the bill that we're talking about here today, I find it ironic that any Member on the other side of the aisle would talk about jobs with a straight face given their record.

In the last 3 months of the Bush administration, the economy was losing, on average, 673,000 jobs per month. In the last 3 months of 2009, the average job loss was 69,000 per month, an improvement of nearly 90 percent. That is not acceptable, but we are trying to bring this economy in a different direction.

They drove this economy into a ditch; let's not forget that. Let's not forget the economy that President Obama inherited. Let's not forget the record job losses and the stock market crash and all the special deals on Wall Street.

I've heard enough from the other side about the issue of jobs. They nearly ruined this economy. They are responsible for the massive job losses that we see now that we're trying to fix. So enough about that.

I will go back to what we are talking about here today, and that is a rule to consider these important bills dealing with clean water for Native American tribes. I again would reiterate that this is a good rule, everything they wanted they got, and I hope it will pass unanimously.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Well, Mr. Speaker, we saw last night that the blame game no longer works. And if we want to look at the past, we will see that when we cut taxes, we made it a reality; the recession after 9/11 was the shortest recession in history.

Now, unfortunately, the policies that are being followed now are totally different. They're increasing debt massively. The deficit as a percentage of GDP after TARP—that I opposed, but it can be said that it was a bipartisan decision, TARP—after TARP, the deficit as a percentage of GDP was 4 percent. Today, 1 year after the Democrats took the Presidency and they had already taken the House and the Senate, the deficit as a percentage of GDP is almost 12 percent, Mr. Speaker.

We are running in a dangerous direction, heading toward a collision with a fiscal crisis of unprecedented proportion. But, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats just don't get it. They don't see it. The American people sent a message last night that they had better, but it still remains to be seen if they received the message.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to my distinguished friend from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. I rise in opposition to the rule.

Today, the press is reporting that a backroom deal has been cut with Democratic leadership to create a deficit-cutting commission by Executive



order. There are also reports that instead of putting every spending program and tax policy on the table, discretionary spending controlled by the Democratic-controlled Appropriations Committee would be exempt.

I oppose creating this panel by Executive order, and the American people will oppose this sleight of hand also. Press reports suggest that the Democratic leadership intends to bring the commission's recommendation up for a vote in Congress, but a vote that is not mandated as it would be if Congress passed similar legislation statutorily. More important, the vote that could take place under the administration's plan would happen after the midterm elections and before the newly elected Congress begins. It would be basically a lame-duck Congress vote. Lawmakers who are retiring or get defeated could vote on a set of recommendations with regard to entitlement spending and tax policy but never be accountable to the American people. Is it right for an outgoing Member of Congress to consider proposals that could affect every single American, knowing that days or weeks later they will no longer answer to voters in the district they once represented?

Between the Democrats and the Republicans in both Chambers, over 30 Members have already announced that they are retiring or running for another office. It is not appropriate for outgoing lawmakers who may eventually lobby for a special interest that has a vested interest in the outcome of the vote on the commission to then vote on that recommendation. Any recommendation put forward should be considered by the newly elected Congress, who will have to publicly stand by their vote on the commission's recommendations, Members who have been elected and are accountable to the American people. A deficit commission established through Executive order amounts to nothing more than political cover.

This Congress has run up the country's credit card to a point of no return, and now the administration wants to be able to tout a bipartisan solution to spending that will conveniently help them survive the upcoming election cycle. All of a sudden, the Obama administration has found deficit-cutting religion. The same administration that pushed through a \$787 billion economic stimulus promising that unemployment would be held under 8 percent now wants to get our Nation's financial house in order. The same administration that promised an open and transparent process on health care reform, which is now being negotiated behind closed doors and could cost taxpayers nearly \$1 trillion, now wants credibility on spending issues.

The FY 2009 budget deficit registered at an unprecedented \$1.4 trillion. I believe the American people understand the depth of our financial problems, recognize the spending gorge that Congress has embarked on, and won't be

fooled by a fig leaf commission established by an Executive order.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the American people will be cut out of the process under this plan. The bipartisan commission process I've talked about, and many Members on both sides have talked about for 4 years, includes a legitimate public engagement mandating public town hall-style meetings throughout the country. Now there will be no input from the hardworking people in our neighborhoods and communities. That is not right, and everyone knows it.

If lawmakers were serious about the debt and the deficit issues that Americans are increasingly worried about, Congress would halt the budget gimmicks, the slick talking points, and muster the political will to have an honest conversation with the American people about where we are, where we're heading, and what changes need to be made to get back on track. But an open process that allows the American people to weigh in will never happen through a commission established by an Executive order all done here in Washington.

This morning, Congressman LAMAR SMITH, our colleague from Texas, in a 1-minute speech on the floor offered a series of lessons to be learned from yesterday's special Senate election in Massachusetts. He said, All true reform starts with the voice of the people. The people will not have a voice in a deficit commission established through an Executive order.

He also said that common sense triumphs partisanship. A commission through Executive order negotiated by one party is the height of partisanship. Republican leadership in the House and the Senate have not been involved in this effort.

He also said voters can exercise real independence. Where is the voice of the people in a process that will not go beyond the Beltway?

In closing, Mr. SMITH correctly, and I say correctly, noted that one-party control leads to arrogance. We are seeing today an arrogance of power by a party that forecloses the minority from a seat at the table. And to be fair, Republicans were just as arrogant at times. Hopefully we have learned a lesson and will never go back to those times.

Mr. SMITH concluded that we should be listening to the American people, not defying them. The people of Massachusetts spoke yesterday. We would be wise in this Congress to heed that lesson.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as we wait for the Republican leader, let me say that I have enjoyed this debate. These are noncontroversial bills that are being brought to the floor, and yet they're important. And, also, there are issues that have been brought out and that

will be brought out now. I will oppose the previous question to bring out the issue that Mr. BUCHANAN talked about and bring it to a floor vote this morning.

Since the Democrats regained the majority in the House, I have heard a number of Members come down to the floor and quote Supreme Court Justice Brandeis that sunshine is said to be the best disinfectant. I think that quote is fitting. It's fitting today considering, as Mr. BUCHANAN pointed out, that as we speak, the majority is drafting, behind closed doors with no sunshine in sight, health care legislation that will affect every American.

So I think the question is begged, what is going on behind those closed doors? We don't know. We do not even know who is at the table. The American people deserve to know what is going on behind closed doors.

□ 1200

We need to bring sunlight, sunshine, into a process that is shrouded with secrecy. That is why I, along with a bipartisan group of 163 Members of this House, have cosponsored House Resolution 847, a resolution by my friend and colleague, Representative BUCHANAN, that expresses the sense of the House that any meetings held to determine the final contents of sweeping health care legislation be held in public view and not behind closed doors. Mr. BUCHANAN pointed out the fact that C-SPAN has offered, in fulfillment of a campaign promise by the President, to be present at the negotiations.

Now, in order to help bring in sunshine to a process that the majority continues to hide from public view, I will be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question so we can amend this rule and allow the House to continue the Buchanan transparency resolution. This vote will give Members of the majority a chance to live up to their promise, as the distinguished Speaker said, "to lead the most honest, most open and most ethical Congress in history."

Madam Speaker, I know that Members are concerned that this motion may jeopardize consideration of the water rights bills and of the settlement bills that are being brought to the floor today; but I wish to make clear that the motion I am making provides for the separate consideration of the Buchanan transparency resolution within 3 days so we can vote on the water rights bills and then, once we are done, so that we can consider the Buchanan transparency resolution, H. Res. 847.

I have been informed that the Republican leader will not be coming down to the floor at this time.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, in closing, let me say a couple of things.

One is that this is a good rule and it should be approved. Secondly, and I say this with respect to my friends on the other side of the aisle, when they talk about sunshine, it's laughable. When you compare the transparency and the openness of this Democratic Congress to the way this place was run when they were in charge, there is no comparison.

I remember one night, after a conference report was completed and when all of the signatures were on the conference report, when they snuck in a special provision to provide special immunity to drug companies. That's the kind of transparency and openness that existed when they were in control.

On the health care bills, they've been on the Web. The House bill has been on the Web, and the Senate bill has been on the Web. Even the Senate read it verbatim. So there has never been as much openness and transparency in any Congress as we've seen in this Congress.

When my friend from Florida talks about the deficit, boy, what a short memory. When Bill Clinton left office, he had eliminated the deficit, and we had started paying down the debt, and we left George Bush, Dick Cheney and my Republican friends with a surplus. Through their reckless policies—tax breaks for millionaires, special privileges for Wall Street and drug companies and all that they did—they racked up a record debt, and they did nothing about it. In fact, when they were in charge, they used to argue on the floor that somehow the deficit and the debt didn't matter anymore. They tried to say it wasn't a big deal.

So they left this President with a mess. I guess it's sometimes fun to make a mess, but it's not so fun and not so easy to clean up a mess. The Democrats in Congress and the President of the United States have to clean up the mess that they left. It's a little bit ironic that those who drove this economy into a ditch are complaining about the size of the tow truck.

The fact of the matter is we have to make some tough decisions. We have to create the conditions for jobs to grow. We have to invest in industries where there is a future, and we are trying to do that.

Again, in the last 3 months of the Bush administration, the economy was losing, on average, 673,000 jobs per month. In the last 3 months of 2009, the average job loss was 69,000 per month, which is an improvement of nearly 90 percent. We on the Democratic side have pledged to do everything we can to help create more jobs in this country and to focus on the issue of jobs, because that's where the concern amongst the American people really is.

In the stock market, stocks have seen significant gains since the begin-

ning of March 2009, following the passage of the Recovery Act, which they all were opposed to. The Dow is up 58 percent. The S&P is up 64 percent. The Nasdaq is up 75 percent.

The GDP has grown. In the first quarter of 2009, the GDP was negative 6.4 percent. By the third quarter of 2009, the GDP was on the rise, increasing plus-2.2 percent, the best quarter for growth in 2 years. Forecasters predict steady GDP growth throughout 2010.

We see home sales are now rising. We see manufacturing beginning to rebound. U.S. manufacturing activity rose 55.9 from 53.6 in November, reaching the highest level since April of 2006. It is a positive indication of broader economic growth.

So it is difficult to sit here and to listen to lectures from Members on the other side of the aisle who created this mess, which is the worst economy since the Great Depression. That's what they gave to President Obama. We have to fix it, and we have pledged to do whatever is necessary to help put people back to work, to help people be able to stay in their homes, and to help nurture growth in future industries.

So, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments from my friends on the other side of the aisle. Given their abysmal record, it's hard to believe they come here with straight faces to talk about these things; but we're going to fix the mess that they made.

Again, I would urge my colleagues to support the rule, and I would urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1017 OFFERED BY MR. DIAZ-BALART

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. On the third legislative day after the adoption of this resolution, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV and without intervention of any point of order, the House shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 847) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any conference committee or other meetings held to determine the content of national health care legislation be conducted in public under the watchful eye of the people of the United States. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 847.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not

merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the *Floor Procedures Manual* published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from *Congressional Quarterly's* "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

# ACCELERATION OF INCOME TAX BENEFITS FOR CHARITABLE CASH CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4462) to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4462

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. ACCELERATION OF INCOME TAX BENEFITS FOR CHARITABLE CASH CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RELIEF OF VICTIMS OF EARTHQUAKE IN HAITI.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, a taxpayer may treat any contribution described in subsection (b) made after January 11, 2010, and before March 1, 2010, as if such contribution was made on December 31, 2009, and not in 2010.

(b) CONTRIBUTION DESCRIBED.—A contribution is described in this subsection if such contribution is a cash contribution made for the relief of victims in areas affected by the earthquake in Haiti on January 12, 2010, for which a charitable contribution deduction is allowable under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) RECORDKEEPING.—In the case of a contribution described in subsection (b), a telephone bill showing the name of the donee organization, the date of the contribution, and the amount of the contribution shall be treated as meeting the recordkeeping requirements of section 170(f)(17) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(d) PAYGO.—All applicable provisions in this section are designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, all of us have witnessed this horrendous event that has taken place on our continent; and I know that, whether Republican or Democrat, we all want to be able to do whatever we can to ease the pain of these poor people. That's why I'm glad that Mr. HERGER is here representing the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee, which did not hesitate to meet and decide on just what we could do as a committee to make it easier to encourage people to make contributions. I know all over the country that people are collecting clothes, food, and things of that nature; but the bottom line is that they need cash; they need checks. This is what we have decided to do.

So we have a nonpartisan bill here on this which deals with the technicality.

It's available on the Web site of the Joint Committee, [www.jct.gov](http://www.jct.gov), and it's listed under Document No. JCX-2-10.

This bill allows Americans and others to make generous cash contributions to the charities of their choice; and at the same time, it allows them not to have to wait until next year to be able to deduct these as charitable contributions. It accelerates the time that this can be done between now and March so that any contribution that is made can be deducted on the 2009 tax return, which is being prepared now for April 15.

In addition to that, there has been some question as to how you can document the actual payment if it were made on the cell phone or if it were made without actually having proof of a charitable deduction. The only proof that could be made would be by using the telephone bill, and there was a question as to whether or not that would be considered as sufficient evidence of making the contribution. This bill will, indeed, make it possible for text messages to be relied upon, text messages which are used on cell phones, when claiming these charitable contributions.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HERGER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HERGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, we have all been moved by the reports and images of last week's horrendous earthquake in Haiti; and we were reminded just this morning of the dire situation that country is facing as reports have surfaced of a major aftershock.

Throughout our history, Americans have been eager to help others recover from the devastation of wars and natural disasters in faraway places. Once again, we have seen the compassion and generosity of the American people displayed front and center in the Haiti relief effort, including an outpouring of real-time donations through cell phones and the Internet. While many of our own U.S. citizens are struggling to find work and to make ends meet, it is only fitting that we should provide immediate tax relief for these charitable contributions.

This bill, which is sponsored by the bipartisan leadership of the Ways and Means Committee, as well as by the whips of both parties and by more than 150 Members from both sides of the aisle, would permit itemizers to treat Haiti-related charitable contributions made through the end of February as if they were made in 2009 rather than in 2010. This would allow itemizers the opportunity to claim the charitable deductions under 2009 returns, which most taxpayers are required to file by April 15 of this year, instead of waiting until they file their 2010 returns.

□ 1215

It would also permit taxpayers who use cell phone text messages to con-

tribute to the relief effort to use their phone bill as a record of their donation. This is a commonsense bipartisan idea, and it deserves the support of every Member. I urge an "aye" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK). He is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, but, more importantly, he has been so closely identified in the bringing back of Haiti before this tragedy. He has been there, and we admire and respect the contributions he is making to rebuild this great nation.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I want to thank all of the Members that are here and the bipartisan support that we have for this great piece of legislation to not only incentivize Americans who continue to do what they have already done, to be able to help the people of Haiti, to be able to take off their contribution or get the tax benefit for giving in their 2009 taxes. I think it is important that we have a strong vote on this piece of legislation.

The Haitian people—I was just there. I spent 2 days on the ground there. Humanitarian workers are working so hard, and the majority of these non-governmental organizations that people can contribute to are doing the best work on the ground as it relates to the feeding and providing of comfort for the Haitians that are in desperate need of international support at this time. Madam Speaker, I would go even further to say hats off to our emergency response and urban rescue people that are really saving lives every day.

With the contributions that Americans give to organizations that are doing great work on the ground, coupled with the Congress and the House's action today of passing this legislation to allow some benefit to that individual for their contribution, will feed into a better response and a better recovery, not only for Haiti, but to also continue to fulfill our humanitarian commitment to the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere.

So I commend the chairman, the rest of the leadership that signed on to this bill, Republican Whip CANTOR, and a number of others that are on the Ways and Means Committee for this bipartisan effort. Thank you so very much.

I am pleased to be a co-sponsor on Chairman RANGEL, Majority Whip CLYBURN, Ranking Member CAMP, and Republican Whip CANTOR's bi-partisan bill that will provide an incentive for our citizens to contribute monetary donations to the relief efforts following the devastating January 12, 2010, earthquake in Haiti.

I filed an almost identical bill yesterday, H.R. 4467—with many co-sponsors.

Under this bill, if a citizen makes a cash contribution before March 1, 2010, they can take the charitable contribution deduction off of their 2009 income taxes, obviously decreasing their 2009 tax liability.

The American people have shown an outpouring of support for the Haitian people during their most vulnerable moment.

There have been countless donations from individual Americans offering whatever help they can.

Now is the time to give an added boost to the nation's charitable spirit by accelerating income tax benefits for Americans making donations.

I just returned from Haiti, witnessing first hand the horror and devastation of the earthquake.

I represent more Haitian Americans than any other Member of Congress, and my district includes Little Haiti in Miami.

With so many of my constituents in pain, I am happy to be a part of this effort to help the Haitian people and all victims of this disaster.

This bill will not only help increase contributions.

But as the bill only applies to cash contributions, the bill encourages the much needed cash to be donated.

Since the night of the earthquake, I have fielded regular calls from constituents who were stranded, and lost loved ones in Haiti.

Last Thursday night in Miami, I convened in four hours an emergency community wide meeting attended by 300 plus people to coordinate the rescue effort amongst first responders, relief experts, and the Haitian American community in Miami.

On Saturday I met with Vice President BIDEN in Miami in Little Haiti and then again at Homestead Reserve Base in Homestead Florida.

On Saturday night, I bought my own 1 way ticket from Miami to Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic on American Airlines.

I landed at 12:30 a.m. (Sunday morning), secured a drive from a Dominican local and together they drove through the night to the Dominican-Haiti border and then crossed into Haiti during sun up arriving at the airport at around 7a EST on Sunday.

Never have I seen such devastation.

I witnessed the rescue of a young 2 year old that has moved me emotionally like nothing before.

Also, let's not forget that Haiti has come to America's aid before.

As an ally Haiti has been instrumental in the forming of our union.

In the Revolutionary war, Haitians fought with Americans for our independence.

Even as recently as 2005, Haiti again came to the aid of ailing Americans as the country offered support in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina.

I am pleased to be a part of this legislation that will help boost our help to Haiti.

What the Chairman's bill (and your bill) does:

This bill will accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti.

Under current law, a taxpayer is allowed to deduct charitable contributions in the taxable year the contribution is made.

The bill asks for an exception to this for cash contributions made to the Haitian relief efforts: A taxpayer who contributes a cash contribution in January or February, 2010, will be allowed to take the charitable contribution deduction in the 2009 taxable year instead of having to wait for the 2010 taxable year.

Mr. HERGER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from California for the time.

I rise today as an original cosponsor of this bill.

As my colleagues have explained, this important measure would accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions to our relief efforts in Haiti. This means that those who are able to contribute now may receive the tax deduction for the 2009 filing period.

With over \$40 million in private and corporate donations already made, this will be a great incentive for the American people to reach even deeper into our pockets and help our friends in Haiti. This, in turn, will augment U.S. Government efforts, demonstrating the clear benefits of public-private partnerships. And it is an important step at a time when we must do more with less in the face of rapidly rising deficits here at home.

There is no doubt that the United States, as a government and as a people, stand side by side with the people of Haiti during this most tragic time. Our assistance efforts so far are unparalleled, and last week, President Obama pledged \$100 million in U.S. funding toward the relief efforts.

It is my hope that, after expeditious surveys of the damage, a significant portion of this funding will come from the \$845 million in international disaster assistance that this Congress has already appropriated for fiscal year 2010. By pulling from these funds, we will be able to quickly address the humanitarian needs in Haiti right now.

In addition, I urge President Obama to immediately begin efforts to convene an international donors' conference to bring together other responsible nations and international organizations that can join the United States in committing efforts to help the Haitian people recover from this horrible disaster.

Keeping in mind the urgent nature of this much-needed assistance, it remains incumbent upon the U.S. to work to ensure that international donations are pooled and integrated, that pledges are tracked, and that transparency measures are put in place to help ensure that aid reaches those who need it.

Further, we should encourage joint ventures and public-private partnerships as we consider the many ways that we may help promote not only the immediate but also the long-term recovery of Haiti as well. The United States will do its share, but the rest of the world must do its best also. Other nations must not forget about Haiti, once the attention on the crisis has subsided, and leave the U.S., as has been often the case, to bear most of the responsibility for the recovery of Haiti.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HERGER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, we have all been deeply moved by the outpouring of support that we have seen from communities across the

United States. Unsurprisingly, the Haitian American community has shown invaluable leadership in the aftermath of last week's tragic earthquake. Now more than ever, the U.S. must focus our efforts on engaging these communities to make sure that they are involved in the rebuilding of their native homeland.

The Haitian diaspora is a valuable resource that must be tapped to ensure that the stability, freedom, success, and prosperity that the Haitian people deserve finally come true.

I would like to thank Chairman RANGEL and Ranking Member CAMP for introducing this important measure. I strongly urge my colleagues to support its passage.

I thank the gentleman again for the time.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the Chair of the Ways and Means Committee in permitting me to speak on this and the rapid action that the committee has taken.

As we are overcome with grief and sympathy for the Haitian tragedy, I am reminded of the devastation I saw in Indonesia in the aftermath of the 2004 tsunami, where over 160,000 people were killed. That disaster inspired cooperation that was truly incredible even in the troubled island of Aceh that had been torn by war for years. That rebuilding effort sparked a terrific renaissance there.

This must signal a new day for the troubled but promising country of Haiti. Obviously, our immediate priority must be saving lives with food, water, shelter, medical supplies. I am pleased that groups in my community, like the acclaimed Mercy Corps, and the Northwest Medical Team, have leaped into action with resources from the Pacific Northwest to make a difference under these dire circumstances.

But we must recognize that decades of crushing poverty in Haiti have left ordinary people far too vulnerable to disaster. We have an obligation as a country, as we work with comprehensive aid efforts in the months and years ahead after the cameras are gone, to help the Haitians rebuild that nation. You know, there are problems with the nation of Haiti. But the world has not always, indeed has seldom been a good neighbor to that troubled country.

I am pleased that this legislation will make it easier for Americans, who face tough times themselves, to help give gifts of life and hope to our neighbors in that devastated island. The bill allows those who have donated to Haiti a chance to claim the donation in the tax return that they are preparing this spring rather than waiting a full year to claim the deduction. It is a simple gesture, but it will encourage giving in this challenging economy and helping do what is right for Haiti.

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the majority whip, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN). There is no question that he has provided the leadership on this issue and inspired the Ways and Means Committee and so many other Members in the Congress. Haiti has a true friend in the heart of JIM CLYBURN, our Democratic whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman RANGEL for yielding me this time.

I want to thank you and Mr. CAMP for bringing this legislation forward. I want to thank the minority whip, Mr. CANTOR, for joining with us in making this a truly bipartisan effort. I also want to thank the 162 cosponsors, original cosponsors, of this legislation.

I believe that all of us who are familiar with the various areas of our great country know that it all depends on where you live as to what kind of catastrophic event you can expect to visit your community. For many of us, it may be a dust storm; for others, like my area of the country, a hurricane; for others, it could very well be an earthquake.

All of us are but the sum total of our experiences, and I believe that it is this vast amount and broad level of experiences that the people of these United States of America are going to call upon in order to respond to the people of Haiti. And for us to offer all Americans the opportunity to deduct on their 2009 taxes any contribution they make to this effort by February 28 will go a long way toward incentivizing the kind of behavior that we think is very, very important.

I want to thank the sponsors of this legislation and thank all of those who will be voting for it today. It is one way that we can say to the people of this Nation that Americans not just sympathize with them but we empathize as well.

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our whip, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise this afternoon in strong support of this important relief legislation for the people of Haiti.

On January 12, 2010, Haiti was shaken by an earthquake unparalleled in its history. As horrendous as they are, the pictures in our newspapers and on TV can only begin to tell the story of the suffering of the Haitian people. Just this morning, the people of that country had another scare, experiencing another shock with a magnitude of 6.1.

Madam Speaker, when crisis calls, American citizens are at their finest. The people of the U.S. have always been, and continue to be, a generous and giving people. And whether it is offering shelter to orphan children, mak-

ing cash donations, or simply volunteering time, when tragedy strikes, the American people take action.

Charitable donations have already begun pouring into organizations assisting in the relief efforts. This legislation allows generous Americans who make a cash donation to the Haitian relief effort to treat those donations as if they were made in the tax year 2009.

□ 1230

Similar policy has been used in past tragedies, and studies show that it actually increases the total amount of charitable contributions.

I want to thank my colleague, Majority Whip CLYBURN, for his assistance in bringing this legislation to the floor. I would also like to thank the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Michigan and their leadership in bringing forward this important bill. While it is often the differences between the parties in Congress that makes the news, this legislation demonstrates that we can come together on commonsense proposals to ease the suffering of our fellow man. When our offices discussed last week how we could help encourage charitable donations for the relief effort, and in particular this proposal, it was clear that partisanship had been set aside. I think the American people and those in Haiti are all the better for it. I ask for support of this legislation.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to, first of all, commend Chairman RANGEL and Ranking Member CAMP for their quick action and leadership on this legislation.

I rise today in strong support of this bill to accelerate the income tax benefits for those who make cash contributions to people affected by the earthquake in Haiti. Americans are deeply saddened at the level of devastation caused by the earthquake that struck Haiti on January 12, resulting in tremendous damage and loss of life.

There are enormous needs in Haiti. It is important to have the Federal Government, our government, demonstrate leadership in providing relief. I also wish to acknowledge and recognize all of the organizations and groups, not-for-profits, churches. Over the weekend, I visited several churches, and I was tremendously impressed at the level of giving that people out of the goodness of their hearts were pouring out. And especially do I congratulate and commend Bishop Blake and the Church of God in Christ churches for the enormous contribution that they are making; the Baptist churches, Methodist churches. All churches. People are demonstrating what it means to give of themselves and to help others.

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4462. On January 12, Haiti was struck by a magnitude 7 earthquake, which devastated the country and people of Haiti. I have lived for approximately a dozen years in earthquake country, and I know how serious an earthquake of this magnitude is. I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to the families who have lost loved ones in this horrible tragedy. Even in the face of this disaster, the people of the world have united in response through prayer, monetary donations, and critical humanitarian aid. In fact, The Chronicle of Philanthropy reported yesterday that over \$275 million has already been generously donated worldwide.

I am again humbled by the efforts of humanitarian aid groups based in west Michigan, which has a long history of charitable giving in times of need. The response to this natural disaster has proved no different. I'm grateful to my constituents for their compassion and generosity, which has existed for many years. Humanitarian aid groups in Grand Rapids that are contributing to the relief effort include Rays of Hope for Haiti, the Christian Reformed World Relief Committee, the Red Cross, and countless others. Even a global corporation located in my district is en route with several flights this week to Haiti, transporting medical supplies and a medical team. The extraordinary efforts by all of these groups are to be commended.

While our country and the world respond to emergency needs in Haiti, I have heard from many in my community who echo my fervent requests to provide additional assistance to the orphans in Haiti. I ask for your continued prayers for the children of Haiti who will soon be united with their adoptive families here in the United States, and especially for those who have been orphaned in the wake of last Tuesday's tragedy. I also urge the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State to greatly speed up the adoption process and visa procedures for not only the orphans already in process but also for all the children who became orphans due to the death of their parents in the horrible earthquake.

I urge my constituents and all Americans to donate to a reputable charity organization for earthquake relief in Haiti. I am very pleased that former Presidents Bush and Clinton are leading efforts through the Clinton-Bush Haiti Fund. This bill, H.R. 4462, will allow taxpayers to deduct their donations from their 2009 taxes, and it is my hope that all people who are able will offer their support to the people of Haiti.

May God bless and comfort the people of Haiti.

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, in closing, I'd simply say that this is a good bill. It reflects the generosity of the American people in responding to a horrific disaster, and I urge all Members to vote "aye."

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4462, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I close this on the high note that America has shown its greatest, especially in this Congress. I want to thank SCOTT MURPHY, a new Member, for insisting that we move forward on this. Of course, the Republicans, Mr. HERGER and Mr. CAMP, who joined together with Democrats to prove that when Americans want to do things, that party labels don't really mean that much. I do hope that the rest of the country would see what we have done and take advantage of this legislation in order to make certain that they have an accurate recording of the contributions that they make through the telephone as well as to take advantage of the expediting of deductions that are being recognized by the Internal Revenue Service.

I hope everyone would vote for this bill and let this be a symbol as to what this Congress can do. It's not just for Haiti, but for ourselves and the rest of the free world.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4462, To Accelerate the Income Tax Benefits for Charitable Cash Contributions for the Relief of Victims of the Earthquake in Haiti Act, authored by my friend and colleague from New York, Representative RANGEL, the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. This important legislation would permit people who make charitable contributions to the relief work in Haiti to take a tax deduction on their 2009 taxes instead of on their 2010 returns. This is an excellent idea which will hopefully spark additional giving to help the people of Haiti.

Tens if not hundreds of thousands of people have lost their lives in the Haitian tragedy and hundreds of thousands more are homeless. The American people have been deeply moved by this crisis and are showing their profound generosity through donations to organizations helping the Haitian people. In fact, as of yesterday, the American Red Cross had already raised \$112 million for Haiti, \$22 million of which came from text messages sent by the American people. The outpouring to Haiti from the great people of this nation and from around the world has been truly overwhelming. I am touched by how Americans from all walks of life have given their time, talents, and financial resources to help those whose lives depend upon such aid.

By permitting taxpayers to take a deduction on their 2009 taxes instead of their 2010 returns, H.R. 4462 will help those Americans who have already donated and encourage those who have not yet done so. In addition to thanking Chairman RANGEL for this legislation, I would also like to mention our col-

league, Representative KENDRICK MEEK, who was developing similar legislation. He has been a leader on all aspects of U.S. policy toward Haiti and deserves to be recognized here in Congress.

Again, I strongly support H.R. 4462 to recognize the generosity of the American people in responding to the devastation in Haiti and to encourage future giving. This is a bill that inspires "the better angels of our nature" and helps the victims of this disaster, as well. It deserves our unanimous support.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of today's bill to accelerate the tax benefits for charitable contributions made in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake in Haiti. The people of Haiti have endured an unimaginable disaster, and our thoughts go out to the millions of families who have been affected by this tragedy.

In times such as these, we must unite in common purpose to help those in need. I am truly heartened by the outpouring of support from the American people, who have contributed hundreds of millions of dollars to disaster relief organizations over the last week despite the economic challenges they face here at home. As policy makers, we should do all we can to encourage this charitable spirit and assist Americans in giving whatever they can through immediate tax relief. The bill will allow people to claim cash contributions made to victims of the Haiti earthquake on their 2009 tax returns, rather than waiting until they file in 2010. It offers an immediate benefit for those who have already made a contribution and provides a little extra incentive for others who are considering a donation of their own.

It is crucial that we join together to support the ongoing rescue and recovery efforts. This bill is a small but necessary component of those efforts, and I remain ready to assist the international community as they bring additional aid and relief to Haiti.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4462 which would allow Americans to deduct the charitable contributions they make to the Haitian relief efforts in January and February of 2010 on their 2009 tax returns. I commend Chairman RANGEL for bringing this bill forward and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The toll of human suffering in Haiti is unimaginable, with up to an estimated 200,000 people who have lost their lives and nearly 3 million people affected by the earthquake. Haiti is the poorest, least developed country in the Western Hemisphere which, even before the quake, suffered from political instability, hurricanes, and food shortages. Even so, the loss of life and destruction from this disaster has left the country in a state of collapse not seen in Haiti in over two centuries.

The images of death and devastation coming from Haiti are driving Americans to donate their time, money, and supplies—it is truly America at its best. All donations, large and small, are helping to provide crucial necessities for this relief effort. Millions of dollars are pouring into non-profit organizations that are making sure that money and supplies go directly where they need to go, to the people of Haiti. The bill we pass today will help encourage even more donations.

We know that the effort to rebuild Haiti and care for those who have been injured will continue for some time to come. The people of Haiti need our help and I am pleased that we

are doing all that we can to promote the generosity Americans have shown since the devastating earthquake shook Haiti last week.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4462.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I lend my full support for H.R. 4462, introduced by my colleague Chairman CHARLES RANGEL, which allows for the acceleration of tax benefits for charitable cash contributions to benefit the victims of the earthquake in the Republic of Haiti on January 12, 2010.

This tax benefit will allow persons who make cash donations to the relief efforts in Haiti from January 11, 2010 to March 1, 2010 the opportunity to claim those donations as charitable contributions on their 2009 Federal Income Tax Return.

The 7.0 earthquake that ravaged the Haitian capital of Port-au-Prince, the city of Jacmel and the city of Carrefour brought immediate devastation to the country, taking the lives of approximately 200,000 people and leaving tens of thousands missing. This event, which has left an estimated 1.5 million homeless, has completely destroyed most of the infrastructure in the capital, and was deemed the largest earthquake of this magnitude in over two centuries in the Republic of Haiti.

Providing a tax benefit on charitable contributions would offer an incentive for American citizens to give during an essential period for the relief effort in Haiti. Several charities saw a significant drop in contributions, which fund the entirety of their operations, due to the economic crisis. Non-profit organizations will need considerable resources to provide the long-term services for a population devastated by a natural disaster. This tax benefit will ensure those resources are funded by an outpouring of generosity from the American people.

In the face of this grave tragedy, the American people have given from their hearts, as well as their pockets, to assist the people of Haiti during this time of extreme hardship and turmoil. This philanthropy should not go unnoticed, especially as many people have chosen to donate at a time when their own financial well-being is uncertain.

I would like to thank Chairman RANGEL for introducing this piece of legislation, and the American people for their benevolence in this time of adversity for the Haitian people.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4462, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CELEBRATING 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF SONG TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1010) celebrating the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. during the 30th anniversary of the Stevie Wonder song tribute to Dr.



King, "Happy Birthday," and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 1010

Whereas the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was properly captured in Dr. King's most famed speech, "I Have A Dream", on August 28, 1963, when he said, "I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal'";

Whereas beginning with the Montgomery Bus Boycott on December 1, 1955, Dr. King led protests, demonstrations, rallies, freedom rides, sit-ins, vigils, all in non-violent fashion, to combat hate, inequality, and racial injustice in the United States;

Whereas following the end of the Montgomery Bus Boycott in 1956, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and others, including Dr. Ralph Abernathy, formed the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) in 1957 to promote civil rights and to bring an absolute and nonviolent end to segregation;

Whereas the efforts of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and those that joined him in the civil rights movement resulted in the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968;

Whereas several U.S. Supreme Court cases decided during the era of the civil rights movement, like *Browder v. Gayle* (352 U.S. 903 (1956)), *Boynton v. Virginia* (364 U.S. 454 (1960)), and *Heart of Atlanta Motel Inc. v. United States* (379 U.S. 241 (1964)) were consistent with the work of Dr. King and others to eradicate segregation and discrimination and deem such practices unconstitutional;

Whereas Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. received the Spingarn Medal in 1957 and the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964, distinctions that were given to him at the young ages of 28 and 35, respectively, for the selflessness and dedication he exhibited in advancing civil rights;

Whereas the life and work of Dr. King, to advance justice, equality, and peace for the entire human race, ended prematurely, when he was assassinated on April 4, 1968, in Memphis, Tennessee, while challenging the inequitable wages and treatment of Memphis sanitation workers;

Whereas Martin Luther King, Jr., was survived by Coretta Scott King, an activist in her own right, and 4 children, 2 sons and 2 daughters, who would also continue the fight for civil rights and equality;

Whereas 4 days after the assassination of Dr. King, on April 8, 1968, Representative John Conyers, Jr. introduced legislation to recognize Dr. King with a Federal holiday that coincided with the great civil rights leader's birthday, January 15, 1929;

Whereas the campaign to secure a Federal holiday in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. lasted 15 years, with the 1980 Stevie Wonder song tribute to Dr. King, "Happy Birthday", solidifying the campaign's success;

Whereas Stevie Wonder dedicated his album sleeve for "Hotter Than July", an album released on September 29, 1980, and upon which "Happy Birthday" is recorded, to Dr. King, with an inscription that read, "[Martin Luther King, Jr.] showed us, non-violently, a better way of life, a way of mutual respect, helping us to avoid much bitter confrontation and inevitable bloodshed";

Whereas Mr. Wonder also wrote on his album sleeve for "Hotter Than July" the following, "We still have a long road to travel until we reach the world that was [Dr.

King's] dream. We in the United States must not forget either his supreme sacrifice or that dream";

Whereas Stevie Wonder encouraged the establishment of a Federal holiday in recognition of Dr. King on his album sleeve for "Hotter Than July" by expressing that, "I and a growing number of people believe that it is time for our country to adopt legislation that will make January 15, Martin Luther King's birthday, a national holiday, both in recognition of what he achieved and as a reminder of the distance which still has to be traveled";

Whereas the song, "Happy Birthday", became a rallying cry, which led to the collection of 6,000,000 signatures in support of a Federal holiday in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., which Stevie Wonder and Coretta Scott King presented to Congressional Leadership in 1982;

Whereas ultimate enactment of legislation designating the third Monday of January as a Federal holiday in observance of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was realized on November 3, 1983, when such legislation was signed into law;

Whereas the first Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal holiday was observed on January 20, 1986, and celebrated with a concert headlined by Stevie Wonder, who has, in the years since, continued his commitment to promoting peace and equality, for which he has been recognized with a Lifetime Achievement Award from the National Civil Rights Museum in Memphis, Tennessee;

Whereas the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. is continued today, as evidenced by the work of organizations like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, which is currently led by Dr. King's daughter, Bernice King, and was at one time led by Dr. King's son, Martin Luther King, III;

Whereas today, the very mission of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference states, "In the spirit of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) is renewing its commitment to bring about the promise of 'one nation, under God, indivisible' together with the commitment to activate the 'strength to love' within the community of humankind"; and

Whereas in addition to organizations, the legacy of Dr. King continues on today with people in the United States and throughout the world, with individual acts of compassion, courage, and peace: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) celebrates the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. during the 30th anniversary of the Stevie Wonder song tribute to Dr. King, "Happy Birthday";

(2) recognizes that the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. continues on with commitments to freedom, equality, and justice, as exhibited by Stevie Wonder and so many others; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to commemorate the legacy of Dr. King by renewing pledges to advance those principles and actions that are consistent with Dr. King's belief that "all men are created equal".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker and Members, I have been doing this for quite a number of years now, and I asked my chief of staff how many years specifically it's been. But we're here again with the ranking member, LAMAR SMITH; with JOHN LEWIS, the last remaining King disciple that worked with Dr. King longer than any of us. Today, we rise to salute not only Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., but also recalling those days when we were marching for a King holiday. We salute Dr. King and Stevie Wonder for the wonderful inspiration he gave us all with his musical tribute to Dr. King, "Happy Birthday."

On Monday, we observed for the 25th year the Federal Martin Luther King, Jr., holiday bill that started off 3 days after his assassination when I made this proposal. It also coincides with the 30th anniversary of Stevie Wonder's 1980 song tribute to Dr. King. Stevie's song became the rallying cry for those fighting for a holiday for Martin Luther King, Jr. He was one of our greatest advocates.

I just wanted to recall—I don't know if JOHN LEWIS remembers—the day at that march we got a call from the White House and they wanted Stevie Wonder to come to the White House. Stevie Wonder said, Well, how come they haven't invited you to come to the White House instead of me? I said, Stevie, that doesn't matter. They want you, and this is what we have been marching for. So you come to the White House. He said, No, I'm not going. And we went back and forth. Finally, he didn't come.

But later, shortly thereafter, we began the negotiations with Jack Kemp of New York, with the Republicans in the White House, and this agreement was struck: That if the House and the Senate could pass a King holiday bill, the President would sign it into law. We felt we could get it through the House, but the other body was another story entirely. Finally, it did happen.

I don't know if you remember the day that Coretta Scott King and all the kids, and Abernathy, Lowery, Julian Bond, we were all over in the other body and the speeches went on and on. Everybody was acclaiming King. You'd have thought he was a native son of all the speakers. It finally ended. They had far more time to consume than we did. A reporter asked me, What took you so long? Everybody seemed to have been for this bill all the time. Of course, I resisted losing my nonviolent disposition to respond to him, because

it took 15 years before that bill was finally taken up by the body. But it was because of the people, it was because of the spirit of the people in the public schools and the city councils, the counties. And the States even passed resolutions for us to do that.

□ 1245

Finally, the pressure built up so much throughout the country that we finally had the bill passed in the other body. The President then, true to his word, signed the bill. It was a great moment in history. I am still proud to say that we seriously honor King with this third Monday of every January. I will put the rest of my remarks in the RECORD.

House Resolution 1010 celebrates the work of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and salutes Stevie Wonder for his song tribute to Dr. King, "Happy Birthday."

On Monday, we observed, for the 27th year, the Federal Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday. This particular commemoration of the King holiday coincides with the 30th anniversary of Stevie Wonder's 1980 song tribute to Dr. King.

Stevie Wonder's song became the rallying cry for those fighting for a Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal holiday, and he proved to be one of the holiday's greatest advocates.

And so, 30 years later, it is fitting that we consider a resolution both honoring Dr. King and saluting Stevie Wonder.

Today, I would like to touch on three significant points. First, having just observed the King Holiday, we are reminded of the more equal and just society that we live in today as a result of Dr. King's life work.

Dr. King's struggle led to the enactment of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and the 1968 Fair Housing Act. From buses to motels, his work brought an end to state-sanctioned segregation and discrimination in public accommodations that were the hallmark of the Jim Crow system.

Personally, and I'm sure like many, I pursue my own life's work in the spirit of Dr. King.

When I first ran to represent the 14th Congressional District of Michigan in 1963, it was with the endorsement of Dr. King that I won.

It was through Dr. King that I got to know Rosa Parks, the mother of the Civil Rights Movement, who would work in my Detroit office for over 20 years.

On my second point, despite the great contributions Dr. King made, the pursuit of a Federal holiday in Dr. King's honor was long fought.

Significantly, it was Stevie Wonder's song tribute to Dr. King, "Happy Birthday," that played a large role in galvanizing public support for a Federal holiday.

Just four days after the assassination of Dr. King, on April 8, 1968, I introduced legislation to observe the life and work of Dr. King with a Federal holiday. Until it became law in 1983, there was a persistent legislative drive for the King Holiday.

Stevie Wonder was one of the leading advocates at the helm during this fight. On September 29, 1980, he released the album, "Hotter than July," containing a song he wrote in honor of Dr. King "Happy Birthday."

Mr. Wonder dedicated the album sleeve for "Hotter than July" to Dr. King with an inscription, and also encouraged the establishment of a Federal holiday in recognition of Dr. King.

Right on the album cover, he wrote, "I and a growing number of people believe that it is time for our country to adopt King Holiday legislation, both in recognition of what he achieved and as a reminder of the distance which still has to be traveled."

That growing number of people equated to 6 million signatures in support of the King Holiday, which Stevie Wonder and Coretta Scott King presented to Congress in 1982.

On the 15th anniversary of Dr. King's assassination, and the 20th anniversary of the March on Washington, Congress passed King Holiday legislation in 1983, with a vote of 338 to 90 in the House and a vote of 78 to 22 in the Senate. That November, it was signed into law.

At the first King Holiday observance, on January 20, 1986, Stevie Wonder headlined a concert in honor of Dr. King. And his commitment to advance the King legacy did not stop there.

Stevie Wonder has gone on to address such social and racial ills as apartheid in South Africa, hunger in Africa, and HIV/AIDS. In fact, his musical and social contributions are so significant that I feel Stevie Wonder is deserving of a Congressional Gold Medal.

Finally, we must continue the legacy of Dr. King—not just on the third Monday in January each year, but every day. It is each and every day that we should work to advance the "Beloved Community" that Dr. King envisioned.

Dr. King said, "Life's most urgent and persistent question is: What are you doing for others?" Let us ask ourselves this question, and act; and not just today, but every day.

I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, for joining me in introducing this bipartisan resolution.

I would also like to acknowledge the many Members of the Judiciary Committee that join us in supporting this resolution—in particular, the gentleman from Texas, our Ranking Member, LAMAR SMITH.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I support House Resolution 1010. This resolution celebrates the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. It also celebrates the 30th anniversary of the release of Stevie Wonder's song tribute to Dr. King entitled "Happy Birthday." Dr. King was the leading champion of a historic nonviolent revolution in the United States. Throughout his life, he fought for racial harmony and equal justice. While advancing this historic movement, Dr. King endured many forms of hatred and even suffered physical abuse. Despite this violence, Dr. King peacefully continued to pursue justice and equality for all.

As a pastor, Dr. King's religious beliefs were essential to the success of his nonviolent efforts. It is doubtful that such a long and enduring movement could have survived without the power of religious inspiration and conviction behind it. From 1957 to 1968, Dr. King traveled over 6 million miles and spoke thousands of times about justice and equal freedom under the law. During those years, he led large protests that drew the attention of the world.

On August 28, 1963, Dr. King led a peaceful march of 250,000 people through the streets of Washington, D.C.; and it is here in this city where he delivered a speech that spoke for all Americans, regardless of the color of their skin. "I have a dream," he said, "that my four little children will one day live in a Nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

Dr. King opened the door of opportunity for millions of Americans. In his "I Have a Dream" speech, Dr. King called the march the "greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our Nation." Four days after the assassination of Dr. King, Representative JOHN CONYERS, now our Judiciary Committee chairman and the cosponsor of the resolution we are now considering, introduced legislation to recognize Dr. King's life's work with a Federal holiday that coincided with Dr. King's birthday, January 15.

Madam Speaker, I just want to say today that I think Chairman CONYERS has been too modest about his significant role in establishing that holiday. In 1980, Stevie Wonder released his song tribute to Dr. King called "Happy Birthday" to bring attention to the movement to enact a Federal holiday in honor of Dr. King. Stevie Wonder sang that Dr. King's vision of peace should be celebrated throughout the world and that a holiday would help achieve Dr. King's dreams of integration and love and unity for all of God's children. On November 3, 1983, legislation was signed into law, designating the third Monday of January as a Federal holiday in observance of Dr. King.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend LAMAR SMITH for his significant contribution and his work as a co-leader on the Judiciary Committee for all the other things that we work on as well.

I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), a gentleman whom I knew before he was a Member of Congress, and he knew me before I was a Member of Congress as well.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and to celebrate the 30th anniversary of Stevie Wonder's song "Happy Birthday." That song was such a fitting tribute to Dr. King and a rallying cry to create the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday that we celebrated last weekend and on Monday.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was my friend. He was my big brother. He was a prophet, and he was my hero. And above all, he was a simple human being filled with love, peace, and compassion for all humankind. Madam Speaker, I want to take the opportunity to thank my colleague, the chairman, Mr. CONYERS, for the great and unbelievable role that you have played in making

this holiday possible. When the historians pick up that pen and write about this period, they would have to write that you, JOHN CONYERS, paved the way to make it possible for people all over America and around the world to stop and celebrate the work of Martin Luther King, Jr.

We, as a Congress, as a Nation, and as a people are deeply indebted to you; and we will never, ever forget the role that you played. Stevie Wonder's song reminds us that there is a better way: the way of love, the way of non-violence. Mr. Chairman, JOHN CONYERS, you never gave up. You never gave in. You and Stevie Wonder kept the faith, and you kept your eyes on the prize. Out of Detroit, out of that unbelievable city, you had the right stuff, the good stuff.

The King holiday is a day of reflection. We all took time to reflect on the legacy of this man who, through his love and his leadership, made our country a better place. It also becomes a day of service. Dr. King preached a doctrine of nonviolence and civil disobedience to combat segregation, discrimination, and racial injustice. Stevie Wonder's song 30 years later still reminds us that we have come a distance, but we still have a long road to travel until we reach the world that was Dr. King's dream.

So it is fitting and appropriate that we pause as a Nation and as a people to remember the life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. And through the music, through the song, "Happy Birthday" by Stevie Wonder, we all continue to be inspired, as Dr. King inspired a Nation and changed America forever.

Madam Speaker, we all spent some time in reflection this weekend and on Monday, but today we encourage all citizens to try to live the teachings of Dr. King. Our Nation will move us closer to Dr. King's dream of creating the beloved community, a community of justice based on human dignity and at peace with itself.

Again, I thank Chairman CONYERS for his work and for bringing this piece of legislation before us today.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Madam Speaker, I did not prepare or plan to speak on this resolution, but I saw my friend JOHN LEWIS on the floor. I went 2 days ago, on this year's M.L. King Day, and I was moved beyond measure to stand on the very spot where Dr. King lost his life, the National Civil Rights Museum in Memphis, Tennessee, at the Lorraine Motel, to tour there and spend a couple of hours. It is an extraordinary museum, an extraordinary place. I would encourage all Americans to go see that, to experience it much more than I had ever dreamed. I had not been there. Even though I'm a Tennessean, even though I feel like, as an American who believes in equality and justice, I feel like a sojourner with my friend JOHN

LEWIS, as the cosponsor with LACY CLAY of the Civil Rights Trail legislation which is pending before this House; cosponsor with JESSE JACKSON JR. of the naming of Emancipation Hall; cosponsor with JOHN LEWIS of the Green McAdoo legislation in Tennessee, recognizing the Clinton 12 and the bravery on the road that we're on.

But to me, Martin Luther King Day is all about equality and justice, the traits of our great Nation that we hold so dear. That process and that journey is not complete. It is not over. We all know it. But great strides have been made, including the election of our President, a crowning achievement in this movement. But I was so moved by how a single bullet from across the street, and I went there as well, changed history but also how at that moment so many things began to happen.

Now Dr. King even knew somehow in his heart, heading into that moment, that it was going to happen. I never realized the depth of that until I went there for 2 hours. A powerful, powerful way to celebrate this progress, this man and this part of our history is to go there. And of course JOHN LEWIS is all over it. You thank Chairman CONYERS. Man, do I ever want to thank you, brother, for your life, for your courage, for the youth movement, for the freedom rides, for all that you have been involved in, for your book, for your legacy, for your service. JOHN LEWIS, a great American.

Obviously, I don't always agree with you, but I respect you immensely. Thank you for how far you have brought us and for all the people who invested their lives in the civil rights movement. Thank you from all of us, from everywhere for the progress that has been made. It's so very important that we continue to fight for equality and justice for all. That's what people from around the world look to our country in amazement about. Our national character is not born out of our greatness and our power and our tall buildings and our military might. It's born out of our character which comes from lessons learned and wrongs made right. That's this journey that we're on. And to all that have given blood and have sacrificed mightily, the United States of America honors you in honoring Dr. King in his legacy.

In many ways, he may have had to give his life to see these things happen, and that's why we honor the life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I just want to tell our colleague from Tennessee, Mr. ZACH WAMP, that that was the most amazing recapitulation of what happens to people when they go and trace these incredible moments in history that many of us have lived through. I particularly appreciate his recollection and his feelings and how they have impacted on his work here in the Congress. I just wanted to thank him for that myself.

And for all of our colleagues, many of whom are submitting statements, I'm

going to put into the RECORD the remarks of President Obama on January 17 as he recalled that day of celebrating the life and legacy of Martin Luther King, Jr., and the article in Politico that also recapitulated the history of the struggle that King led, which is not over.

And although the raw violence that accompanied that struggle in those days—remember, the men, women and children who were in the struggle were risking their lives. This wasn't a philosophical discussion or a theoretical examination of where they were in history. This was an unbelievably brutal period of our history.

□ 1300

We recall that not in bitterness, but in honest reflection. I remember the trilogy written on King. Taylor Branch wrote three volumes on King, and I recommend it strongly to anybody who wants to read it. There have been many, many other records of this part of our history, but to JOHN LEWIS and me, Taylor Branch seemed to capture it with the detail and passion that few others were able to summon up.

[From the White House, Jan. 17, 2010]

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT IN REMEMBRANCE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. Praise be to God. Let me begin by thanking the entire Vermont Avenue Baptist Church family for welcoming our family here today. It feels like a family. Thank you for making us feel that way. (Applause.) To Pastor Wheeler, first lady Wheeler, thank you so much for welcoming us here today. Congratulations on Jordan Denice—aka Cornelia. (Laughter.)

Michelle and I have been blessed with a new nephew this year as well—Austin Lucas Robinson. (Applause.) So maybe at the appropriate time we can make introductions. (Laughter.) Now, if Jordan's father is like me, then that will be in about 30 years. (Laughter.) That is a great blessing.

Michelle and Malia and Sasha and I are thrilled to be here today. And I know that sometimes you have to go through a little fuss to have me as a guest speaker. (Laughter.) So let me apologize in advance for all the fuss.

We gather here, on a Sabbath, during a time of profound difficulty for our nation and for our world. In such a time, it soothes the soul to seek out the Divine in a spirit of prayer; to seek solace among a community of believers. But we are not here just to ask the Lord for His blessing. We aren't here just to interpret His Scripture. We're also here to call on the memory of one of His noble servants, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Now, it's fitting that we do so here, within the four walls of Vermont Avenue Baptist Church—here, in a church that rose like the phoenix from the ashes of the civil war; here in a church formed by freed slaves, whose founding pastor had worn the union blue; here in a church from whose pews congregants set out for marches and from whom choir anthems of freedom were heard; from whose sanctuary King himself would sermonize from time to time.

One of those times was Thursday, December 6, 1956. Pastor, you said you were a little older than me, so were you around at that point? (Laughter.) You were three years old—okay. (Laughter.) I wasn't born yet. (Laughter.)

On Thursday, December 6, 1956. And before Dr. King had pointed us to the mountaintop, before he told us about his dream in front of the Lincoln Memorial, King came here, as a 27-year-old preacher, to speak on what he called "The Challenge of a New Age." "The Challenge of a New Age." It was a period of triumph, but also uncertainty, for Dr. King and his followers—because just weeks earlier, the Supreme Court had ordered the desegregation of Montgomery's buses, a hard-wrought, hard-fought victory that would put an end to the 381-day historic boycott down in Montgomery, Alabama.

And yet, as Dr. King rose to take that pulpit, the future still seemed daunting. It wasn't clear what would come next for the movement that Dr. King led. It wasn't clear how we were going to reach the Promised Land. Because segregation was still rife; lynchings still a fact. Yes, the Supreme Court had ruled not only on the Montgomery buses, but also on *Brown v. Board of Education*. And yet that ruling was defied throughout the South—by schools and by States; they ignored it with impunity. And here in the Nation's capital, the Federal Government had yet to fully align itself with the laws on its books and the ideals of its founding.

So it's not hard for us, then, to imagine that moment. We can imagine folks coming to this church, happy about the boycott being over. We can also imagine them, though, coming here concerned about their future, sometimes second-guessing strategy, maybe fighting off some creeping doubts, perhaps despairing about whether the movement in which they had placed so many of their hopes—a movement in which they believed so deeply—could actually deliver on its promise.

So here we are, more than half a century later, once again facing the challenges of a new age. Here we are, once more marching toward an unknown future, what I call the Joshua generation to their Moses generation—the great inheritors of progress paid for with sweat and blood, and sometimes life itself.

We've inherited the progress of unjust laws that are now overturned. We take for granted the progress of a ballot being available to anybody who wants to take the time to actually vote. We enjoy the fruits of prejudice and bigotry being lifted—slowly, sometimes in fits and starts, but irrevocably—from human hearts. It's that progress that made it possible for me to be here today; for the good people of this country to elect an African American the 44th President of the United States of America.

Reverend Wheeler mentioned the inauguration, last year's election. You know, on the heels of that victory over a year ago, there were some who suggested that somehow we had entered into a post-racial America, all those problems would be solved. There were those who argued that because I had spoke of a need for unity in this country that our nation was somehow entering into a period of post partisanship. That didn't work out so well. There was a hope shared by many that life would be better from the moment that I swore that oath.

Of course, as we meet here today, one year later, we know the promise of that moment has not yet been fully fulfilled. Because of an era of greed and irresponsibility that sowed the seeds of its own demise, because of persistent economic troubles unaddressed through the generations, because of a banking crisis that brought the financial system to the brink of catastrophe, we are being tested—in our own lives and as a nation—as few have been tested before.

Unemployment is at its highest level in more than a quarter of a century. Nowhere is

it higher than the African American community. Poverty is on the rise. Home ownership is slipping. Beyond our shores, our sons and daughters are fighting two wars. Closer to home, our Haitian brothers and sisters are in desperate need. Bruised, battered, many people are legitimately feeling doubt, even despair, about the future. Like those who came to this church on that Thursday in 1956, folks are wondering, where do we go from here?

I understand those feelings. I understand the frustration and sometimes anger that so many folks feel as they struggle to stay afloat. I get letters from folks around the country every day; I read 10 a night out of the 40,000 that we receive. And there are stories of hardship and desperation, in some cases, pleading for help: I need a job. I'm about to lose my home. I don't have health care—it's about to cause my family to be bankrupt. Sometimes you get letters from children: My mama or my daddy have lost their jobs, is there something you can do to help? Ten letters like that a day we read.

So, yes, we're passing through a hard winter. It's the hardest in some time. But let's always remember that, as a people, the American people, we've weathered some hard winters before. This country was founded during some harsh winters. The fishermen, the laborers, the craftsmen who made camp at Valley Forge—they weathered a hard winter. The slaves and the freedmen who rode an underground railroad, seeking the light of justice under the cover of night—they weathered a hard winter. The seamstress whose feet were tired, the pastor whose voice echoes through the ages—they weathered some hard winters. It was for them, as it is for us, difficult, in the dead of winter, to sometimes see spring coming. They, too, sometimes felt their hopes deflate. And yet, each season, the frost melts, the cold recedes, the sun reappears. So it was for earlier generations and so it will be for us.

What we need to do is to just ask what lessons we can learn from those earlier generations about how they sustained themselves during those hard winters, how they persevered and prevailed. Let us in this Joshua generation learn how that Moses generation overcame.

Let me offer a few thoughts on this. First and foremost, they did so by remaining firm in their resolve. Despite being threatened by sniper fire or planted bombs, by shoving and punching and spitting and angry stares, they adhered to that sweet spirit of resistance, the principles of nonviolence that had accounted for their success.

Second, they understood that as much as our Government and our political parties had betrayed them in the past—as much as our nation itself had betrayed its own ideals—Government, if aligned with the interests of its people, can be—and must be—a force for good. So they stayed on the Justice Department. They went into the courts. They pressured Congress, they pressured their President. They didn't give up on this country. They didn't give up on Government. They didn't somehow say Government was the problem; they said, we're going to change Government, we're going to make it better. Imperfect as it was, they continued to believe in the promise of democracy; in America's constant ability to remake itself, to perfect this union.

Third, our predecessors were never so consumed with theoretical debates that they couldn't see progress when it came. Sometimes I get a little frustrated when folks just don't want to see that even if we don't get everything, we're getting something. (Applause.) King understood that the desegregation of the Armed Forces didn't end the civil rights movement, because black and white

soldiers still couldn't sit together at the same lunch counter when they came home. But he still insisted on the rightness of desegregating the Armed Forces. That was a good first step—even as he called for more. He didn't suggest that somehow by the signing of the Civil Rights Act that somehow all discrimination would end. But he also didn't think that we shouldn't sign the Civil Rights Act because it hasn't solved every problem. Let's take a victory, he said, and then keep on marching. Forward steps, large and small, were recognized for what they were—which was progress.

Fourth, at the core of King's success was an appeal to conscience that touched hearts and opened minds, a commitment to universal ideals—of freedom, of justice, of equality—that spoke to all people, not just some people. For King understood that without broad support, any movement for civil rights could not be sustained. That's why he marched with the white auto worker in Detroit. That's why he linked arm with the Mexican farm worker in California, and united people of all colors in the noble quest for freedom.

Of course, King overcame in other ways as well. He remained strategically focused on gaining ground—his eyes on the prize constantly—understanding that change would not be easy, understand that change wouldn't come overnight, understanding that there would be setbacks and false starts along the way, but understanding, as he said in 1956, that "we can walk and never get weary, because we know there is a great camp meeting in the promised land of freedom and justice."

And it's because the Moses generation overcame that the trials we face today are very different from the ones that tested us in previous generations. Even after the worst recession in generations, life in America is not even close to being as brutal as it was back then for so many. That's the legacy of Dr. King and his movement. That's our inheritance. Having said that, let there be no doubt the challenges of our new age are serious in their own right, and we must face them as squarely as they faced the challenges they saw.

I know it's been a hard road we've traveled this year to rescue the economy, but the economy is growing again. The job losses have finally slowed, and around the country, there's signs that businesses and families are beginning to rebound. We are making progress.

I know it's been a hard road that we've traveled to reach this point on health reform. I promise you I know. (Laughter.) But under the legislation I will sign into law, insurance companies won't be able to drop you when you get sick, and more than 30 million people—(applause)—our fellow Americans will finally have insurance. More than 30 million men and women and children, mothers and fathers, won't be worried about what might happen to them if they get sick. This will be a victory not for Democrats; this will be a victory for dignity and decency, for our common humanity. This will be a victory for the United States of America.

Let's work to change the political system, as imperfect as it is. I know people can feel down about the way things are going sometimes here in Washington. I know it's tempting to give up on the political process. But we've put in place tougher rules on lobbying and ethics and transparency—tougher rules than any administration in history. It's not enough, but it's progress. Progress is possible. Don't give up on voting. Don't give up on advocacy. Don't give up on activism. There are too many needs to be met, too much work to be done. Like Dr. King said, "We must accept finite disappointment but never lose infinite hope."

Let us broaden our coalition, building a confederation not of liberals or conservatives, not of red states or blue states, but of all Americans who are hurting today, and searching for a better tomorrow. The urgency of the hour demands that we make common cause with all of America's workers—white, black, brown—all of whom are being hammered by this recession, all of whom are yearning for that spring to come. It demands that we reach out to those who've been left out in the cold even when the economy is good, even when we're not in recession—the youth in the inner cities, the youth here in Washington, D.C., people in rural communities who haven't seen prosperity reach them for a very long time. It demands that we fight discrimination, whatever form it may come. That means we fight discrimination against gays and lesbians, and we make common cause to reform our immigration system.

And finally, we have to recognize, as Dr. King did, that progress can't just come from without—it also has to come from within. And over the past year, for example, we've made meaningful improvements in the field of education. I've got a terrific Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan. He's been working hard with states and working hard with the D.C. school district, and we've insisted on reform, and we've insisted on accountability. We're putting in more money and we've provided more Pell Grants and more tuition tax credits and simpler financial aid forms. We've done all that, but parents still need to parent. (Applause.) Kids still need to own up to their responsibilities. We still have to set high expectations for our young people. Folks can't simply look to government for all the answers without also looking inside themselves, inside their own homes, for some of the answers.

Progress will only come if we're willing to promote that ethic of hard work, a sense of responsibility, in our own lives. I'm not talking, by the way, just to the African American community. Sometimes when I say these things people assume, well, he's just talking to black people about working hard. No, no, no. I'm talking to the American community. Because somewhere along the way, we, as a nation, began to lose touch with some of our core values. You know what I'm talking about. We became enraptured with the false prophets who prophesized an easy path to success, paved with credit cards and home equity loans and get-rich-quick schemes, and the most important thing was to be a celebrity; it doesn't matter what you do, as long as you get on TV. That's everybody.

We forgot what made the bus boycott a success; what made the civil rights movement a success; what made the United States of America a success—that, in this country, there's no substitute for hard work, no substitute for a job well done, no substitute for being responsible stewards of God's blessings.

What we're called to do, then, is rebuild America from its foundation on up. To reinvest in the essentials that we've neglected for too long—like health care, like education, like a better energy policy, like basic infrastructure, like scientific research. Our generation is called to buckle down and get back to basics.

We must do so not only for ourselves, but also for our children, and their children. For Jordan and for Austin. That's a sacrifice that falls on us to make. It's a much smaller sacrifice than the Moses generation had to make, but it's still a sacrifice.

Yes, it's hard to transition to a clean energy economy. Sometimes it may be inconvenient, but it's a sacrifice that we have to make. It's hard to be fiscally responsible

when we have all these human needs, and we're inheriting enormous deficits and debt, but that's a sacrifice that we're going to have to make. You know, it's easy, after a hard day's work, to just put your kid in front of the TV set—you're tired, don't want to fuss with them—instead of reading to them, but that's a sacrifice we must joyfully accept.

Sometimes it's hard to be a good father and good mother. Sometimes it's hard to be a good neighbor, or a good citizen, to give up time in service of others, to give something of ourselves to a cause that's greater than ourselves—as Michelle and I are urging folks to do tomorrow to honor and celebrate Dr. King. But these are sacrifices that we are called to make. These are sacrifices that our faith calls us to make. Our faith in the future. Our faith in America. Our faith in God.

And on his sermon all those years ago, Dr. King quoted a poet's verse:

Truth forever on the scaffold  
Wrong forever on the throne . . .  
And behind the dim unknown stands God  
Within the shadows keeping watch above his own.

Even as Dr. King stood in this church, a victory in the past and uncertainty in the future, he trusted God. He trusted that God would make a way. A way for prayers to be answered. A way for our union to be perfected. A way for the arc of the moral universe, no matter how long, to slowly bend towards truth and bend towards freedom, to bend towards justice. He had faith that God would make a way out of no way.

You know, folks ask me sometimes why I look so calm. (Laughter.) They say, all this stuff coming at you, how come you just seem calm? And I have a confession to make here. There are times where I'm not so calm. (Laughter.) Reggie Love knows. My wife knows. There are times when progress seems too slow. There are times when the words that are spoken about me hurt. There are times when the barbs sting. There are times when it feels like all these efforts are for naught, and change is so painfully slow in coming, and I have to confront my own doubts.

But let me tell you—during those times it's faith that keeps me calm. (Applause.) It's faith that gives me peace. The same faith that leads a single mother to work two jobs to put a roof over her head when she has doubts. The same faith that keeps an unemployed father to keep on submitting job applications even after he's been rejected a hundred times. The same faith that says to a teacher even if the first nine children she's teaching she can't reach, that that 10th one she's going to be able to reach. The same faith that breaks the silence of an earthquake's wake with the sound of prayers and hymns sung by a Haitian community. A faith in things not seen, in better days ahead, in Him who holds the future in the hollow of His hand. A faith that lets us mount up on wings like eagles; lets us run and not be weary; lets us walk and not faint.

So let us hold fast to that faith, as Joshua held fast to the faith of his fathers, and together, we shall overcome the challenges of a new age. (Applause.) Together, we shall seize the promise of this moment. Together, we shall make a way through winter, and we're going to welcome the spring. Through God all things are possible. (Applause.)

May the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King continue to inspire us and ennoble our world and all who inhabit it. And may God bless the United States of America. Thank you very much, everybody. God bless you. (Applause.)

[From POLITICO, Jan. 15, 2010]

HEED KING: CUT POVERTY FOR ALL

(By Wade Henderson and John Podesta)

The Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. and his Southern Christian Leadership Conference decided in November 1967—less than five months before he was assassinated—to take their civil rights movement in a new direction. King set sail on a voyage to “lead waves of the nation's poor and disinherited to Washington, D.C., in the spring of 1968 to demand redress of their grievances by the United States government and to secure at least jobs or income for all.”

As early as 1966, King conveyed his concern, in speeches and private conversations, about the link between poverty and social instability and was readying an effort to expand his movement to include poverty reduction among all races. King had come to understand a reality that continues to plague American society more than 40 years after his death: that entrenched poverty and joblessness damage our country's social fabric.

These same issues remain an ugly stain on our nation, despite considerable racial progress in many areas over the past 40 years. In 2008, almost 40 million Americans lived beneath the poverty line, and nearly one in four children lived in a household struggling against hunger.

Poverty reduction across all races is critically important, but we must also be brutally honest about the racial disparities that continue to separate black and Hispanic Americans from white Americans. While the poverty rate among whites was 8.6 percent in 2008, 24.7 percent of blacks and 23.2 percent of Latinos lived in poverty.

Unemployment rates are also stubbornly divergent based on race. The unemployment rate for white men over 20 was an unhealthy 9.3 percent in December 2009, but for Latino men it was 12.8 percent, and for black men it was an unconscionable 16.6 percent.

And while some educational achievement gaps have narrowed slightly over time, there remain massive racial disparities, representing a threat to our long-term economic growth. In eighth-grade math, for instance, black students are roughly three grade levels behind their white peers.

Such disparities demand serious, committed and prompt action, starting with a strategy to create good jobs that provide decent wages, benefits and pathways out of poverty in the hardest-hit communities.

Last year's recovery legislation played a critical role in averting disaster and curbing job loss, but we now know that there is a longer-term need than was originally imagined. As Congress moves to address the unemployment crisis, any jobs bill that aims to secure our economy from the bottom up must include three key elements: direct job creation, assistance for struggling families and aid to states and localities.

A plan to directly create jobs must balance the need to put people to work right away with a long-term strategy to create living-wage jobs for low-income and minority communities. The former can be accomplished through strategies such as funding for temporary jobs that meet needs in distressed communities, summer jobs and national service opportunities for unemployed youth. The latter will require investments in job training for high-growth fields and programs that combine work and learning.

In addition, economists tell us that the best way to spur economic growth is to help struggling families through extended unemployment benefits, refundable tax credits and food stamps. Not only do such investments help sustain the most vulnerable workers and families, but those workers' increased spending also ripples through the

economy to help all Americans by increasing business income and creating more jobs.

We must also avert additional job losses and service cuts stemming from state and local government deficits. Without federal aid, approximately 900,000 more jobs will be lost in a sector that offers employment opportunities and critical public services to low-income and minority communities.

Finally, we need a commitment from the federal government to cut poverty in half between 2010 and 2020. Our organizations collaborate on the Half in Ten Campaign because we believe that a goal of cutting the poverty rate in half over the next decade provides focus and accountability in the fight to rebuild this country's middle class and ensure that low-income and minority communities are not left behind during economic recovery. By setting a target, our government can also create a vision for shared prosperity that breaks down silos across government agencies, engages the private sector and inspires innovative solutions.

Any plan to halve poverty must also aim to reduce racial and ethnic economic disparities. America will be a majority-minority country by 2050. We must be vigilant about addressing disparities now, not only because it is the right thing to do but because the fate of communities of color is intertwined with our future as a nation.

King wrote in 1967, "The time has come for us to civilize ourselves by the total, direct and immediate abolition of poverty." Just as King came to advocate, Congress must promptly act to alleviate poverty, create jobs, and eliminate racial disparities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the resolve to commemorate Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. during the 30th anniversary of the Stevie Wonder tribute to Dr. King, "Happy Birthday". This resolve was introduced by chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, JOHN CONYERS. Like myself, Chairman CONYERS is a longtime musician and music aficionado.

Dr. King worked his entire life to make the world a better place, and to create equality for those who did not have it. We have come a very long way since he began his work. However, we still have a long way to go before we make his "dream" become a reality. It is always important to recognize and remember those who have done great things for our great country, and recognizing Dr. King's accomplishments and dreams during the 30th anniversary of Stevie Wonder's tribute to him would be very fitting. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, and as a musician, I find this resolution to be of special significance, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Although Dr. King's life ended in Memphis Tennessee, it began in Atlanta, Georgia on January 15, 1929. He spent his life working to end racial segregation and racial discrimination through civil disobedience and non-violent protests. On April 28, 1963, he gave one of the most famous civil rights speeches of all time in his "I Have a Dream" speech. The speech painted a picture of a future that we are still trying to achieve where people will be "not judged by the color of their skin, but the content of their character". Dr. King was assassinated on April 4, 1968, in Memphis Tennessee. Dr. King was one of many significant people from Georgia that are remembered in history. It is important that we take time to remember the contributions he made to our society. His contributions have already brought him many accolades. In 1964, he won the Nobel Peace Prize, becoming the youngest

person to have been awarded this honor, and in 1965 he was awarded the American Liberties Medallion by the American Jewish Community. In 1963, he was named Time Person of the Year. The list of awards and recognitions he has received is very long and prestigious, and it is only fitting for us to recognize his achievements as well.

Stevie Wonder wrote, produced and performed the song "Happy Birthday" in 1981. It was performed to let the world know how important it was to him that Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday be celebrated as a national holiday. It is for this reason that the timing of this commemoration of Dr. King is so significant. As a member of the Judiciary and a long time musician, I urge my colleagues to support this resolve.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1010.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HONORING SEVEN AMERICANS KILLED IN AFGHANISTAN ON DECEMBER 30, 2009

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1009) honoring the seven Americans killed in Khost, Afghanistan, on December 30, 2009, for their service to the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 1009

Whereas the men and women of the Central Intelligence Agency are dedicated professionals who work tirelessly to protect the United States;

Whereas many of the individuals serving the Central Intelligence Agency do so under harsh conditions, far from home, and on the front lines of the battle against terrorists;

Whereas these public servants face great risks in the line of duty on a daily basis;

Whereas seven Americans in the service of the Central Intelligence Agency gave their lives for their country in a bombing that took place in Khost, Afghanistan, on December 30, 2009;

Whereas six additional Americans were wounded in the attack, some of them suffering serious injuries;

Whereas the loss of these highly trained counterterrorism experts will be deeply felt throughout the Intelligence Community; and

Whereas the entire Nation owes an enormous debt of gratitude to these proud Americans, their families, and their loved ones for the quiet, dedicated, and vital service they offered to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the seven Americans who died in the bombing that took place in Khost, Afghanistan, on December 30, 2009, and the families of those patriots for their service and their sacrifice for the United States;

(2) expresses condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of those killed in the bombing;

(3) offers support and hope for a full recovery for those who were wounded in the bombing; and

(4) shares in the pain and grief felt in the aftermath of such a tragic event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, on December 30, while many of us were watching football, traveling back from holiday visits with our families, or preparing to usher in the new year with loved ones, seven members of the Central Intelligence Agency family had their lives cut short in an attack on Forward Operating Base Chapman in Khost, Afghanistan. This was the deadliest day for the CIA since the bombing of the Beirut Embassy in 1983.

The news of this tragic loss was of particular personal sadness and difficulty for me. I had the privilege to meet the Khost team when I last visited Afghanistan on a committee oversight trip. I can attest that these men and women were among the finest America has to offer. They did not shy from the dangers they knew existed, and they believed in the mission they were asked to perform. They worked tirelessly in an environment that is always dangerous. I am proud of the work that they did and the work that their colleagues continue to do today to keep our country safe.

The officers who died in Khost were true professionals. They were savvy officers who relied on years of experience to make judgments and to calculate risk. These men and women were deployed to an area of great danger and hardship, and they did so knowing that the worst could happen. But, they did it anyway, because we as a Nation are relying on them and colleagues like them to make the United States safe from the threat of terrorism.

I realize that many people have a distorted vision of what it means to be part of the CIA family. Movies and books have made the life of a CIA officer seem exciting. It wasn't until I



joined the Intelligence Committee that I fully understood the unique sacrifices that the men and women of the CIA and their families are willing to make in service to our Nation. In addition to the inherent dangers of the job, there are long separations from family and loved ones, often without explanation and on very short notice. Birthdays and holidays are spent in foreign corners of the world.

To those who were wounded in the attack, let me just add my personal thanks for your service and wish you a full and speedy recovery.

To the families of those who lost their lives on December 30, you have our deepest appreciation and gratitude. In this time of grief, please know that you are in our prayers and that this tragic loss will never be forgotten. It is my hope that you can find solace in the selfless, quiet devotion that these brave men and women gave for the safety and protection of our great Nation. They made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of all of us. And all Americans owe them, and you, a great debt for their commitment and dedication to a job that very rarely receives any kind of public recognition.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's introducing this resolution and bringing it to the floor. It has been cosponsored by all Republican and Democrat members on the Intelligence Committee, and I think it is an appropriate way to honor the sacrifice of those who were killed or wounded in this tragic accident.

Madam Speaker, those in the intelligence community work, serve our Nation, indeed, in dangerous places and in dangerous circumstances. I will never forget an incident shortly after I first joined the Intelligence Committee in this House. I had been on a trip to Iraq where I had gotten to see firsthand more of what our intelligence community members as well as our members of the military do in that conflict, and on my way back home to Texas, I was on a commercial flight where there was a soldier who was on leave going back home. When the plane landed in Amarillo, all of the passengers stayed seated, let the soldier get off first, and applauded him. There were some tears around the plane, all of which was very, very appropriate. But in the back of my mind, I was always thinking about those people who serve our Nation who do not wear a uniform, whose brave acts will never be known and will never get the public recognition that our military sometimes get. It is, in fact, tragic that it is only in death that these individuals are honored in this more public way, but they clearly do a job that is essential to our country's security, and especially to the fight against terrorists to prevent further terrorist acts here.

I think it is also important, Madam Speaker, to point out that these individuals gave their lives doing exactly the kind of intelligence gathering that is absolutely essential to stopping terrorists. They were trying to gather human intelligence, information from human sources. And to gather that kind of information, you often have to deal with some rather unsavory-type characters in dangerous places. But the fact of the matter is that we will not be successful in stopping terrorists unless we gather that sort of information. And so these Americans who were willing to put themselves into dangerous places, dangerous circumstances, were gathering exactly the kind of information we have to have to secure our country.

There has been a lot of talk since the Fort Hood shooting and the attempt at bombing an airliner in Detroit about connecting the dots. Well, the truth of the matter is the more information we can gather closer to the front lines, closer to the center of where terrorists operate, the easier it is to connect those dots. And gathering that information out on the front lines at the tip of the sword, as it is sometimes said, that is exactly what these officers were doing.

So I think it is important for us all to resolve to support them in that effort. Certainly to try to find ways to encourage and support their efforts, not to appoint special prosecutors to go after people who are getting that kind of information, but to support their efforts.

The other point I would like to make is I think in this situation there is an extra burden placed on families. Because these officers were undercover, there is a lot of media interest and so forth, the families cannot go through the traditional kind of grieving process like other families can. As the chairman mentioned, I hope they know that they are certainly in our prayers even as we honor their loved ones who served our Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the Chair of the Select Intelligence Oversight Panel and a member of our Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing this resolution forward, and I rise in support of the resolution and to offer my condolences to the families, friends, and colleagues of the seven clandestine service officers who were killed by a suicide bomber in Khost, Afghanistan, a couple of weeks ago, and to offer support and appreciation and best wishes for those recovering from their injuries.

As Chair of the Select Intelligence Oversight Panel and a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I am well aware, as we all are here, of the risk to forward-deployed clandestine service employees, a risk they face on a daily basis.

These seven employees gave their lives in the line of duty, and our thoughts and prayers remain with their loved ones. May they find comfort in part in the knowledge of the high service these people have given to their country.

Let me also take a moment to express my wishes for a full and speedy recovery to those wounded in the bombing and my appreciation to all Americans, civilian and military, who are serving our Nation in Afghanistan. We look forward to the day when their presence in Afghanistan will no longer be needed and that they will return home safely to their families.

I thank Chairman REYES for offering this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to a member of the Intelligence Committee and the ranking member of the Terrorism Subcommittee on the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

□ 1315

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As we Members come to the floor from time to time to pass resolutions, to talk about resolutions supporting athletic events or special occasions, it is always difficult for us to come to the floor to talk about people who have given their lives in the defense of this country, who have been injured in the duty that they are performing for this Nation.

Being at a forward operating base for someone within the intelligence community or the CIA is about as far outside the wire as you can get. In some of the most austere conditions, men and women are asked to ascertain intelligence so that we here in the United States of America can remain safe and secure in our homes and our business places. Seven individuals gave that ultimate sacrifice. It is altogether fitting that this House would pause to give honor to those seven individuals and their families, and to the individuals who have been injured. And as my colleagues have already said, I wish them a speedy recovery, but also to say thank you.

Thank you to the men and women of the clandestine services who are willing to do what they do 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. We in this House, we as Americans, owe them a debt of gratitude that we will never be able to repay.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, it is now my honor to recognize for 1 minute a former ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, and certainly someone that knows and understands the sacrifices that our men and women in the CIA make every day. We are fortunate to have her as the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank him for giving us the privilege to come to the floor to honor the

lives, the leadership, the service and sacrifice of the seven CIA officers killed, and those who were wounded in Afghanistan on December 30, 2009.

For those of us who have worked closely with members of the intelligence community, visited them and their stations around the world, some undercover, some not, we know the sacrifice that they make. Like so many of the dedicated men and women in the intelligence community, these officers worked far from home, close to the enemy, and on the front lines of the fight for freedom and security around the world.

They were mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers, sons and daughters, friends and loved ones. They never asked for recognition or credit, for medals or awards. They simply sought to fulfill their duty to protect our Nation, to secure the blessings of a brighter future for our people, to bear any burden, as President Kennedy said, in the name of our safety, our shared values, and our common ideals.

Go back a number of years before terrorism became such an important part of our intelligence gathering, go back a couple of decades, force protection was one of the primary responsibilities of the intelligence community. When they were sent into harm's way or in anticipation of that, the intelligence community was the advance team and the ongoing force protector. And so as we honor on every occasion, and we will later today, our men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan, we know that there are people taking risks to protect them as we talk about honoring them. These are the members of the intelligence community in their various manifestations.

The stories of these intelligence officers, theirs were stories of sacrifice, tales of bravery in the face of danger, and valor in the face of great peril. In carrying out their mission, they gave hope to children, families, and complete strangers. We are the land of the free and the home of the brave because of them. In performing acts of extraordinary courage, they advanced the cause of peace. In answering the calls of service, they became heroes.

These officers knew we live in a time of peril at home and around the world. As the attack on them in Afghanistan, the failed plot on Christmas Day, and the shootings at Fort Hood remind us, intelligence must remain the first line of defense against terrorism and other threats to global security and peace.

We must continue to support those still in the field, the men and women who, taking inspiration from their fallen colleagues, keep pursuing their mission on every front. In the words of this resolution, the entire Nation owes an enormous debt of gratitude to these proud Americans, their families, and their loved ones for the quiet, dedicated, and vital services offered to the United States. May their proud and selfless acts be a source of strength and inspiration to all Americans. May

those so painfully touched by this event find comfort in knowing the thoughts and prayers of our entire Nation are with them at this very sad and difficult time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) a member of the Intelligence Committee and the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this resolution.

As the gentleman from Texas indicated earlier, it is unfortunate that it is only at times like this that many of the American people realize just what an outstanding service is performed by the men and women of the Central Intelligence Agency day in and day out, year in and year out. They perform missions and they put themselves at risk in ways that many of us cannot even imagine.

I have only been a member of the Intelligence Committee for less than a year, but during that time I have had the opportunity to visit with members of the CIA at remote outposts, seeing the type of conditions under which they live, seeing the burdens they bear, seeing the risks that they endure. And it should be reminded to all of us that not only do we honor these seven men and women who were murdered in the line of duty, not only do we offer our condolences to the family members of those who were killed, and not only do we pray for those who are recovering from their wounds, but we should also, I think, take an extra moment to express our solidarity for those that are in the field today, those who are doing, as we are standing here on the House floor here today speaking, as we go back to our apartments tonight, as we go back to our districts over the next several days and be with our families, that there are men and women out there who will not be with their families, who will not be living in the comfort we take for granted in this Nation.

And it also should be reminded to us that we should not find ourselves being Monday morning quarterbacks or second-guessing these men and women who were on the field, who have to make literally life and death decisions at any moment. And sometimes looking back on them years later we can say they should have done this, they should have done that. The reality is they are the people on the front lines. They are the people actually, as Congressman MILLER said, almost beyond the front lines. They are as remote as you can be in many instances, and also have to take extraordinary risks, as they did in this situation.

Because if we are going to win the war against terrorism, we have to obtain the intelligence. We have to get that information that is so vital to heading off attacks. And we can't do it just by intercepts. We can't do it al-

ways in a neat and easy way. It has to be done by people putting themselves on the line, actually going out and meeting with those who may turn out to be, as in this case, double agents or triple agents.

So let's just again express our heartfelt admiration, our sympathy, our sense of condolence for all these people who, again, died so tragically, these brave men and women. But also keep in mind that there are many, many more brave men and women out in the field today doing this exact same type of work. And they deserve our support. So it is not only at times like this, in times of tragedy, that we acknowledge them, but we acknowledge them 365 days a year for the work that they do.

With that, again, I am proud to support the resolution.

Mr. REYES. It is now my honor to yield 2 minutes to my colleague on the Intelligence Committee, Mr. SCHIFF from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I join my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Intelligence Committee, in honoring the seven American intelligence professionals who lost their lives at Forward Operating Base Chapman on December 30, and their six colleagues who were wounded in the attack.

It is the nature of service in the intelligence community that the American public will never know the names of some of the dead and wounded. These patriots served quietly, often undercover, and when they are lost, their families and colleagues must mourn them in private.

It is a blessing, I think, of service on the Intelligence Committee that we get the chance to visit intelligence officials here at home and around the world. We have the chance to get to know them, to see the courage that they exhibit. More than that, we have a chance to thank them. But we also get a chance to see the strain it puts on their lives and on the lives of their families, a sacrifice that is not rewarded with the kind of public attention and public thanks that their colleagues in uniform often receive. But we are here today to express our profound gratitude for their service and to share in the grief that has been suffered and visited upon their families.

In the coming months, seven stars will be etched into the CIA's memorial wall, joining 90 other employees who died in service to the United States. Even today, 35 of the 90 stars honor the sacrifice of officers whose identities still remain classified. I hope that all of our colleagues will join us in expressing our deepest condolences to the families of those who were lost, and friends, and to pay homage to these patriots, whose service and sacrifice has made each one of us more secure.

I yield the floor and thank, again, the chairman for his sponsorship of this resolution.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYES. I now yield 3 minutes to the former ranking member on the Intelligence Committee and the current Chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Intelligence, a lady that I have had the privilege of traveling with around the world to visit our men and women in the intelligence community, Ms. HARMAN from California.

Ms. HARMAN. I thank Chairman REYES for yielding to me and for the nice things that he says not only about me but surely about the women and men who serve our intelligence community around the world. And I thank him for authoring this resolution.

Madam Speaker, every single time I enter CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia, the first thing I do is to look at the wall of stars displayed in the lobby, each star, as we just heard, signifying a loss somewhere in the world of an agency employee. Some of those stars have no names attached, underscoring the sensitivity and singular importance of the missions undertaken by CIA women and men. On my most recent visit to Langley, in late December, I asked my host if any new stars had been added to the wall. Yes, he said, simply. Sadly, the next time I or anyone else enters CIA headquarters, seven more stars will be on that wall, stars honoring patriots I probably met on one of my many trips that I made as ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, and more recently as chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Intelligence.

On those trips I always meet with our intelligence officers to hear firsthand about their work and to thank them for their service and sacrifice. When a suicide bomber took those seven lives at Forward Operating Base Chapman, Americans got a rare glimpse of the dangerous reality that our intelligence community faces on a daily basis. There is no question, Madam Speaker, that their work has saved and will continue to save American lives.

So on behalf of a grateful Nation, our profound gratitude goes to the families of Harold Brown, Elizabeth Hanson, Dane Paresi, Scott Roberson, and Jeremy Wise, and to those of two others whose names are not disclosed. We also salute those who were wounded in the attack and their families.

Madam Speaker, accurate, actionable, and timely intelligence is America's first line of defense, the so-called tip of the spear.

□ 1330

These intelligence professionals died in an effort to penetrate the top leadership of al Qaeda. I believe that the best way to honor them is by supporting their colleagues, who continue to put their lives on the line in the service of the American people and defense of our Nation. Let us do so this afternoon by supporting this bipartisan resolution.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just to emphasize the point made earlier by the gentleman from New

York (Mr. KING), as we come today to honor those who sacrifice their lives and their families for their sacrifice, as we come today to honor and express our appreciation for those who are wounded and wish them a speedy recovery, it is also important that we reaffirm our support to those who are all over the world also in dangerous places, in dangerous circumstances, carrying out the Nation's business in the intelligence community. I think we are uniquely situated in Congress, not only to oversee their activities, but to support and encourage the work that they do that can never be shared with the outside world. So I think it's appropriate to have this resolution, but I think it's also important for all Members of this body to reaffirm our support for those who serve our Nation in this way.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the time and for your leadership.

Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of H. Res. 1009. Today we are honoring the seven members of our intelligence community who were tragically killed on December 30 and their colleagues who were injured by a suicide bomber at our CIA base in Khost, Afghanistan. In honoring these brave men and women, we also seek to express our deep support and appreciation to all the civil servants who dedicate their lives to protecting our Nation. We mourn the loss of all of these seven brave heroes.

Along with the Congresswoman from the 13th District of Ohio, I would like to take a moment to reflect on the loss of Scott Roberson, an Ohio native who was among those killed in this tragic attack. Scott dedicated his life to serving and protecting. He spent many years as a police officer before serving with the U.N. Security Forces in Kosovo. He also served several tours in Iraq as a security officer before his assignment in support of U.S. efforts in Afghanistan.

Members of Scott's family reside in my district. When I had the deep honor of attending his memorial service some days ago, as I sat among his family and friends, I listened to those who knew him best speak of his character and unwavering commitment to protecting the safety and security of all Americans. By all accounts, Scott was an exceptional person who, along with his selfless colleagues, sacrificed beyond measure to protect us.

He left behind a loving wife expecting their first child, a child who will know her father through our hero's family and friends and through this resolution passed in honor of the service and sacrifice that he and his colleagues have given on our behalf and on behalf of our great Nation.

For those families who cannot publicly mourn their loss, please know

that our hearts, our thoughts, and our prayers are with you. And to all of the families, know that the sacrifice of your parent, your child, your sibling or spouse does not go unrecognized and will not be forgotten.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to a valiant member of the Intelligence Committee and the chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the bravery and sacrifice of the seven CIA officers and contractors who gave their lives in the line of duty during the December 30 bombing of a CIA base in Khost, Afghanistan. My thoughts and prayers are with them and with their families. I also want to recognize those Americans who were injured in the blast and offer my best wishes for a full and quick recovery.

Madam Speaker, as we have all learned by now, a suicide bomber who was believed to possess valuable information critical to counterterrorism operations entered the U.S. forward operating base in Khost, where he activated explosives that took the lives of seven Americans, including one of our Nation's top counterterrorism experts as well as a Jordanian intelligence officer. Six other Americans standing nearby were also injured in the explosion.

The men and women of our intelligence community do critically important work behind a veil of secrecy, yet as this tragic incident reminds us, they're still exposed to the dangers that come from the difficult and often thankless job of protecting our Nation. Unlike our soldiers in uniform, these public servants must keep their many victories secret while their rare failures and raw grief make headlines.

My thoughts and prayers again are with the families of these brave men and women. They and all the other patriots who serve so honorably in our intelligence community have my unending gratitude and my unwavering support. And I, I know along with all of my colleagues, will continue to do everything in our power to ensure that they have the tools and the resources and the encouragement they need to continue to keep America safe.

May God bless those who lost their lives and those who are injured.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank all my colleagues for their great words and condolences and sympathy in honor of those who were killed in Khost.

Again, personally, I extend my condolences to the families and friends

who are forever impacted by this tragic loss. And to those who are recovering today from injuries they received in this attack, I wish you a full and fast recovery.

We, as Members of Congress, recognize that we have a tremendous responsibility to provide our men and women in the intelligence community all the tools that they need to carry out their mission. We are forever grateful. We are blessed to have these men and women serving, protecting our great Nation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) women and men who were killed recently in Khost, Afghanistan.

I recently returned from a House Intelligence Committee oversight visit to various locations in Europe and the Middle East. I met with a number of CIA officers, who provided me with exhaustive briefings on the December 30 bombing in Khost, Afghanistan.

That bombing killed seven of their CIA colleagues and wounded a number of others, several grievously.

Many others have offered words of praise for the selfless patriots who gave their lives for their country, and words of condolence to their families and loved ones. In memorial services and private funerals scheduled for the coming weeks, many more will surely do the same. I am honored to add my voice to this chorus.

I have met with hundreds of CIA professionals in my years on the Intelligence Committee. I can tell you that they are invariably brave, committed patriots who have dedicated their lives to the protection of this nation. Their jobs are difficult and dangerous in the best of times. In others—as the recent tragedy reminds us their missions require the ultimate sacrifice.

We owe the seven Americans killed in Khost our thanks and praise. We owe their families our condolences and our prayers. And we owe their colleagues our respect, admiration, and gratitude.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, seven brave Americans were killed in the line of duty on December 30, 2009, in Khost, Afghanistan.

On that day, we lost good and honorable public servants, whose contributions to our national security will be dearly missed. We lost productive citizens—loving parents, siblings, children of Americans who will never see their loved ones again.

We honor their records of service and their sacrifice. We honor their willingness to serve our country during turbulent and dangerous times.

I extend on behalf of my constituents sincerest condolences to the families of those who have died.

Nothing we say here can heal the wounds of those who loved them. But decisions we make here can ensure that their lives were not lost in vain.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1009. One of those individuals honored today in this resolution spent her formative years in the northern Illinois Congressional district that I am proud to represent. Miss Elizabeth C. Hanson of Rockford, Illinois deployed to Afghanistan as part of America's war against terrorist extremists. On December 30, 2009, Elizabeth, along with six colleagues

from the Central Intelligence Agency and a Jordanian liaison officer, was killed when a suicide bomber attacked the base where they were stationed.

Elizabeth Hanson was born in February 1979 and graduated from Keith Country Day School in 1997. She attended Colby College during the time of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. Elizabeth joined the CIA as a specialist tasked with collecting information on terrorists, and she was part of a team dedicated to defeating America's worst enemies.

Elizabeth Hanson served her country with passion, dedication, and conviction. Elizabeth will be sorely missed by her family, friends, and all who had the privilege of knowing her. I am enclosing for the RECORD a copy of a recent local newspaper editorial that honored her service.

[From the RRStar.com Editorial, Jan. 17, 2010]

BRAVE, REMARKABLE WOMAN WENT FROM  
KEITH TO THE CIA

In the weeks since CIA employee Elizabeth Hanson died in a suicide bombing in Afghanistan, her college placement adviser at Keith Country Day School has reflected on what the loss meant.

Sally Hoff's words should shed new light on the heroism that Hanson exhibited in the dark corners of Afghanistan.

Hanson, 30, was among seven CIA employees who died Dec. 30 when a double agent detonated an explosive device at a remote base near the Pakistan-Afghanistan border.

Hoff worked closely with Hanson for two years at Keith, a private college preparatory school, before Hanson graduated in 1997.

At first, the former counselor's deep sadness was paired with shock that Hanson worked for the CIA. Then it seemed to fit.

She recalled Hanson's courage, energy and resolve—traits unusual for most teenagers.

"Although she was involved in many activities and had a lot of friends, I was aware of a strong sense of independence and self-reliance in her," Hoff wrote in an e-mail to the Editorial Board.

"As we moved through the college selection process, she was clearly the captain of her destiny; she made her own decisions without seeking much input from family and friends.

"There's a marked amount of bravery in that for a 17-year-old," Hoff wrote.

Hanson went on to attend Colby College in Maine, a highly selective liberal arts school where she majored in economics. She graduated in 2001. A professor at Colby told The Associated Press that Hanson didn't study economics as a path to a lucrative job in the financial world. Her concern wasn't so much the raw data, Michael Donihue said, but the behaviors behind it.

"There are some who come into economics because they're interested in making money," he said. "Others want to look at the world in a different way."

At Keith, Hanson was known as Bitsy. She was a vivacious, generous, friendly young woman who seemed to enjoy challenging herself in academics and extracurriculars, according to Hoff.

"I feel honored to have known this remarkable young woman!" Hoff wrote.

This community is honored that Hanson gave her life trying to unlock the secrets of al-Qaida and its terrorist network. Our condolences to her family and friends. May the pride that her hometown feels in her sacrifice be some comfort.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the seven brave Americans who recently lost their lives in Afghanistan.

I was deeply saddened to learn of the seven Americans who died in the December 30th suicide blast at Forward Operating Base Chapman. This tragic bombing was the deadliest single attack on U.S. intelligence personnel in decades.

Over and over again, the men and women who serve the Central Intelligence Agency have shown their dedication to their mission and the protection of the United States.

These seven Americans served with distinction at a facility on the front lines in the Khost province, an area which borders North Waziristan and is believed to be al-Qaeda's home base.

Unfortunately, this terrible event also has a connection to my home state. We've been hit hard in the Northwest. Over 60 service members from Washington State or assigned from Washington military installations have died in Afghanistan. Of that, 32 were killed in the past year from Fort Lewis, a major Army base in my district.

Regrettably this tragic event only adds to that total. One of the victims, Dane Clark Paresi, was a DuPont, Washington resident and former Fort Lewis soldier. Paresi retired from 1st Special Forces Group at Fort Lewis in 2008, concluding 27 years in the Army. He is survived by his wife, two daughters, parents and five siblings.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family and the families of the other brave Americans who lost their lives. Their service will not be forgotten.

For the six additional Americans that were injured in the attack, I would like to offer my support and hope for their full recovery.

The men and women of the CIA have done everything their country has asked of them and more. We all should have the utmost respect and admiration for their service and sacrifice. The loss of these highly trained counterterrorism experts will be deeply felt throughout the Intelligence Community.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker I rise today in support of H. Res. 1009, honoring the seven Americans killed in Khost, Afghanistan in a suicide attack on December 30, 2009. I extend my sincere condolences to their families and friends, as well as to the entire intelligence community.

The men and women of the clandestine services face great personal danger to protect the United States. Their work is largely done in the shadows and seldom do they receive the credit and recognition they so deeply deserve. We owe them a debt of gratitude for their courageous service.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I have seen firsthand the work these men and women are doing to protect Americans on the frontlines of international conflicts. While their names may never be made public, their memory and the impact of their service will not be forgotten.

The loss of seven American men and women in the December 30th attack is a tragedy for both the intelligence community and our country, and my thoughts and prayers are with the families of those who were killed.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1009.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002 AMENDMENT

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2611) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Securing the Cities Initiative of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2611

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## **SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF SECURING THE CITIES INITIATIVE.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Title XIX of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

### **“SEC. 1908. AUTHORIZATION OF SECURING THE CITIES INITIATIVE.**

“(a) *FINDINGS.*—Congress finds the following:

“(1) *The Securing the Cities Initiative of the Department uses next generation radiation detection technology to detect the transport of nuclear and radiological material in urban areas by terrorists or other unauthorized individuals.*

“(2) *The technology used by partners in the Securing the Cities Initiative leverages radiation detection technology used at ports of entry.*

“(3) *The Securing the Cities Initiative has fostered unprecedented collaboration and coordination among its Federal, State, and local partners.*

“(4) *The Securing the Cities Initiative is a critical national capability to detect the dangerous introduction of nuclear and radiological material.*

“(b) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Director of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office of the Department for the Securing the Cities Initiative such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year, including—

“(1) *for each city in which it has been implemented by fiscal year 2009—*

“(A) *\$40,000,000 for fiscal year 2010;*

“(B) *\$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2011; and*

“(C) *not less than \$10,000,000 in sustainment assistance for each fiscal year thereafter; and*

“(2) *for additional Securing the Cities initiatives to be implemented in not fewer than 2 sites participating in the Urban Area Security Initiative, such sums as may be necessary each fiscal year to implement and sustain each additional initiative.”*

(b) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1907 the following new item.

“Sec. 1908. Authorization of Securing the Cities Initiative.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2611, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2611, a bill authorizing the Securing of the Cities Initiative, was introduced by Representative PETER KING, the ranking member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, on May 21, 2009 and marked up and ordered reported by the committee on November 11, 2009.

The Securing the Cities (STC) Initiative is a unified effort among Federal, State, and local law enforcement in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to defend against the threat of a radiological or nuclear device. DHS, the New York Police Department, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey and officials from three States and 91 localities are involved in this partnership.

The concept behind the STC is to build rings around New York City to provide a layered defense against the smuggling of a nuclear weapon. The more law enforcement officials who have the ability to detect and are on the lookout for nuclear and radiological material in and around New York City, the better chance that law enforcement has to prevent a successful nuclear attack.

The STC has procured thousands of basic handheld radiation detectors which have been distributed to police officers throughout the region. Advanced vehicles, including trucks and boats with radiation detectors capable of distinguishing different radioactive materials, are also in use in Manhattan and the surrounding area.

More than 1,400 local officers have received training in radiation detection operations under STC. STC funding is given to the New York Police Department, which acts as the grant distributor for the funds. State and local entities around New York City are eligible to receive STC funding.

Participants in STC conduct periodic aerial screening in addition to the checkpoints that the NYPD sets up twice a day on Manhattan roadways as a defensive, training, and deterrence measure.

Today, STC is limited to jurisdictions in and around New York City. An amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Texas and included in the legislation before us today will broaden the scope of the STC program to include at least two additional Urban Area Security Initiative cities in the program. The bill authorizes appropriations of \$40 million per city for the first year, with smaller sums available for sustainment in the following years.

The STC is a great example of a successful Federal, State, and local part-

nership. We are in the early stages, and much work remains to be done. That said, the positive initial results justify the continuation and gradual expansion of the program directed in this bill.

During the second session of the 110th Congress, the House passed a measure similar to the one before us today. I urge my colleagues to again support this important Homeland Security legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

At the outset, let me thank Chairman THOMPSON of the Homeland Security Committee and my good friend from New York, Congresswoman CLARKE, for her strong efforts on this legislation, which is truly bipartisan. The addition of two additional cities makes it truly a national program in scope.

Madam Speaker, when we look at London, when we look at Madrid, it becomes clear that a very likely means of attack by terrorists in the United States would be from suburban areas into urban areas. And certainly in New York, which is the number one terrorist target in the world, enormous steps have been made to protect us against that type of attack, specifically a dirty bomb attack coming from outside the city through the highways, the parkways, the tunnels, the bridges, actually into Manhattan itself, which has already, as we know, devastatingly on September 11, also in 1993, been attacked by Islamic terrorists. But also a number of other plots against New York City have been thwarted.

New York City is definitely the main target in the country, but any number of other cities are as well. That is why I believe the program, which has been implemented in New York, can be a model for other cities throughout the country.

Now, I was very concerned last year when the administration decided to zero out all money for this funding in its budget. This was, I believe, a serious mistake. Fortunately, Congress, by appropriating \$40 million in this House and finally \$20 million when it came back from conference committee, did continue to fund this program, because we need these radiological detectors on the highways, the toll plazas, the bridges and the tunnels.

□ 1345

I have had the privilege of attending a number of these drills and training sessions when they are conducted. As Representative CLARKE said, we're not just talking about New York City. We're talking about a large number of police departments and first responders—fire departments, EMS services—from not just New York City but from Long Island, from Connecticut, from New Jersey. We're talking about the State police, and we're talking about Federal support as well, seeing them

all working together in a cohesive way to stop what would be the absolutely devastating impact of a dirty bomb attack, the human toll that that would take, the devastating economic impact it would have, the fact that it would make parts of the city unlivable for extended periods of time, and the fact that it would, in effect, cut off transportation into New York City.

All of these are reasons that we have to go ahead and continue with this Securing the Cities program. It's no guarantee, but it's another layer of defense that we need to protect ourselves against a terrorist attack.

As we know, the terrorists are constantly adapting, and we have to try to stay one step ahead of them. We have to always be on our guard. Actually, we have to be lucky all the time. They only have to be lucky once. We have to rely on more than luck. We have to have preparation, and we have to have a layered defense.

That's why I am so proud to support this legislation which will, in effect, almost set in stone the importance of the Securing the Cities program. We will expand it beyond New York City because, again, while Congresswoman CLARKE and I feel that those of us in the New York area are the main targets, the fact is that a human life is a human life; an American life is an American life. Whether it's New York City or any other city in this country, any, certainly, major urban area, I believe this program is adaptable and compatible to those areas.

So I thank Congresswoman CLARKE for her effort. I thank the bipartisan support that we have for this legislation, and I, certainly, strongly urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, as you have heard, the measure under consideration is important Homeland Security legislation that has previously received and that again deserves the support of the Members of the House of Representatives.

In closing, I encourage my colleagues to vote "aye" on passage of the bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2611, permanently authorizing the Securing the Cities initiative. I thank Chairman THOMPSON, Ranking Member KING and my New York colleagues and cosponsors Representatives ISRAEL and CLARKE for their efforts to bring this bill forward.

Securing the Cities was created to design and implement a layered approach for the detection and interdiction of illicit radiological materials in New York. While this program was initially a pilot and significant progress has been made, unfortunately detection technology and systems are not yet fully in place. Given the known threats that New York faces, it is no surprise that NYPD considers this initiative the most important federal security program. We must continue Securing the Cities until all technology and systems are fully operable.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, I have fought to fund this security imperative, and passing this bill will help ensure that funding continues in future years.

I thank my colleagues for their hard work and dedication to ensure our most threatened cities are adequately protected, and I urge a yes vote on H.R. 2611.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to express my strong support of H.R. 2611, a bipartisan measure authorizing the Department of Homeland Security's Securing the Cities initiative.

I would like to recognize my colleague, Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON, for his leadership on the House Homeland Security Committee and his commitment to protecting the citizens and homeland of our great nation.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank Ranking Member PETER KING for introducing this important legislation which includes an amendment I offered that would expand the scope of the Securing the Cities program to include at least two additional high-risk urban areas, making it a national program.

Launched in 2006, Securing the Cities is a unified effort among Federal, state and local law enforcement officials in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to defend against the threat of a radiological or nuclear attack. Presently, Securing the Cities operates only in New York City and its surrounding areas.

While it appears that New York City remains the prime target for terrorist activity, it is important to ensure that other densely populated areas and those housing critical infrastructure are equally protected from dirty bombs. My amendment would benefit even more high-risk urban areas by providing the necessary resources to detect and intercept illicit radiological material before it is used in a weapon by would-be terrorists.

Through a ring of detectors on highways, bridges, tunnels and on mobile units around the city, Securing the Cities provides a layered defense against the smuggling of a nuclear weapon. The idea behind Securing the Cities is that the more law enforcement officials are on the lookout for nuclear material outside New York City, the better chance law enforcement has to prevent a successful nuclear attack.

Like New York City, Houston is among the highest threat cities in the nation. Our region is extremely dense with critical infrastructure assets, which includes our large energy and petrochemical sectors. By replicating the success of Securing the Cities in more places like Houston, we can bolster law enforcement capabilities to combat potential terrorist activity and protect our communities.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2611.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2611, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NUCLEAR FORENSICS AND ATTRIBUTION ACT

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur

in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 730) to strengthen efforts in the Department of Homeland Security to develop nuclear forensics capabilities to permit attribution of the source of nuclear material, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Nuclear Forensics and Attribution Act".*

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

*Congress finds the following:*

(1) *The threat of a nuclear terrorist attack on American interests, both domestic and abroad, is one of the most serious threats to the national security of the United States. In the wake of an attack, attribution of responsibility would be of utmost importance. Because of the destructive power of a nuclear weapon, there could be little forensic evidence except the radioactive material in the weapon itself.*

(2) *Through advanced nuclear forensics, using both existing techniques and those under development, it may be possible to identify the source and pathway of a weapon or material after it is interdicted or detonated. Though identifying intercepted smuggled material is now possible in some cases, pre-detonation forensics is a relatively undeveloped field. The post-detonation nuclear forensics field is also immature, and the challenges are compounded by the pressures and time constraints of performing forensics after a nuclear or radiological attack.*

(3) *A robust and well-known capability to identify the source of nuclear or radiological material intended for or used in an act of terror could also deter prospective proliferators. Furthermore, the threat of effective attribution could compel improved security at material storage facilities, preventing the unwitting transfer of nuclear or radiological materials.*

(4)(A) *In order to identify special nuclear material and other radioactive materials confidently, it is necessary to have a robust capability to acquire samples in a timely manner, analyze and characterize samples, and compare samples against known signatures of nuclear and radiological material.*

(B) *Many of the radioisotopes produced in the detonation of a nuclear device have short half-lives, so the timely acquisition of samples is of the utmost importance. Over the past several decades, the ability of the United States to gather atmospheric samples—often the preferred method of sample acquisition—has diminished. This ability must be restored and modern techniques that could complement or replace existing techniques should be pursued.*

(C) *The discipline of pre-detonation forensics is a relatively undeveloped field. The radiation associated with a nuclear or radiological device may affect traditional forensics techniques in unknown ways. In a post-detonation scenario, radiochemistry may provide the most useful tools for analysis and characterization of samples. The number of radiochemistry programs and radiochemists in United States National Laboratories and universities has dramatically declined over the past several decades. The narrowing pipeline of qualified people into this critical field is a serious impediment to maintaining a robust and credible nuclear forensics program.*

(5) *Once samples have been acquired and characterized, it is necessary to compare the results against samples of known material from reactors, weapons, and enrichment facilities, and from medical, academic, commercial, and other facilities containing such materials, throughout the world. Some of these samples are available to the International Atomic Energy Agency*



through safeguards agreements, and some countries maintain internal sample databases. Access to samples in many countries is limited by national security concerns.

(6) In order to create a sufficient deterrent, it is necessary to have the capability to positively identify the source of nuclear or radiological material, and potential traffickers in nuclear or radiological material must be aware of that capability. International cooperation may be essential to catalogue all existing sources of nuclear or radiological material.

### SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS FOR FORENSICS CO-OPERATION.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President should—

(1) pursue bilateral and multilateral international agreements to establish, or seek to establish under the auspices of existing bilateral or multilateral agreements, an international framework for determining the source of any confiscated nuclear or radiological material or weapon, as well as the source of any detonated weapon and the nuclear or radiological material used in such a weapon;

(2) develop protocols for the data exchange and dissemination of sensitive information relating to nuclear or radiological materials and samples of controlled nuclear or radiological materials, to the extent required by the agreements entered into under paragraph (1); and

(3) develop expedited protocols for the data exchange and dissemination of sensitive information needed to publicly identify the source of a nuclear detonation.

### SEC. 4. RESPONSIBILITIES OF DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE.

(a) **ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.**—Section 1902 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as redesignated by Public Law 110-53; 6 U.S.C. 592) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (9), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (10) as paragraph (14); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

“(10) lead the development and implementation of the national strategic five-year plan for improving the nuclear forensic and attribution capabilities of the United States required under section 1036 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010;

“(11) establish, within the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, the National Technical Nuclear Forensics Center to provide centralized stewardship, planning, assessment, gap analysis, exercises, improvement, and integration for all Federal nuclear forensics and attribution activities—

“(A) to ensure an enduring national technical nuclear forensics capability to strengthen the collective response of the United States to nuclear terrorism or other nuclear attacks; and

“(B) to coordinate and implement the national strategic five-year plan referred to in paragraph (10);

“(12) establish a National Nuclear Forensics Expertise Development Program, which—

“(A) is devoted to developing and maintaining a vibrant and enduring academic pathway from undergraduate to post-doctorate study in nuclear and geochemical science specialties directly relevant to technical nuclear forensics, including radiochemistry, geochemistry, nuclear physics, nuclear engineering, materials science, and analytical chemistry;

“(B) shall—

“(i) make available for undergraduate study student scholarships, with a duration of up to 4 years per student, which shall include, if possible, at least 1 summer internship at a national laboratory or appropriate Federal agency in the field of technical nuclear forensics during the course of the student's undergraduate career;

“(ii) make available for doctoral study student fellowships, with a duration of up to 5 years per student, which shall—

“(I) include, if possible, at least 2 summer internships at a national laboratory or appropriate Federal agency in the field of technical nuclear forensics during the course of the student's graduate career; and

“(II) require each recipient to commit to serve for 2 years in a post-doctoral position in a technical nuclear forensics-related specialty at a national laboratory or appropriate Federal agency after graduation;

“(iii) make available to faculty awards, with a duration of 3 to 5 years each, to ensure faculty and their graduate students have a sustained funding stream; and

“(iv) place a particular emphasis on reinvigorating technical nuclear forensics programs while encouraging the participation of undergraduate students, graduate students, and university faculty from historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Tribal Colleges and Universities, Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-serving institutions, Alaska Native-serving institutions, and Hawaiian Native-serving institutions; and

“(C) shall—

“(i) provide for the selection of individuals to receive scholarships or fellowships under this section through a competitive process primarily on the basis of academic merit and the nuclear forensics and attribution needs of the United States Government;

“(ii) provide for the setting aside of up to 10 percent of the scholarships or fellowships awarded under this section for individuals who are Federal employees to enhance the education of such employees in areas of critical nuclear forensics and attribution needs of the United States Government, for doctoral education under the scholarship on a full-time or part-time basis;

“(iii) provide that the Secretary may enter into a contractual agreement with an institution of higher education under which the amounts provided for a scholarship under this section for tuition, fees, and other authorized expenses are paid directly to the institution with respect to which such scholarship is awarded;

“(iv) require scholarship recipients to maintain satisfactory academic progress; and

“(v) require that—

“(I) a scholarship recipient who fails to maintain a high level of academic standing, as defined by the Secretary, who is dismissed for disciplinary reasons from the educational institution such recipient is attending, or who voluntarily terminates academic training before graduation from the educational program for which the scholarship was awarded shall be liable to the United States for repayment within 1 year after the date of such default of all scholarship funds paid to such recipient and to the institution of higher education on the behalf of such recipient, provided that the repayment period may be extended by the Secretary if the Secretary determines it necessary, as established by regulation; and

“(II) a scholarship recipient who, for any reason except death or disability, fails to begin or complete the post-doctoral service requirements in a technical nuclear forensics-related specialty at a national laboratory or appropriate Federal agency after completion of academic training shall be liable to the United States for an amount equal to—

“(aa) the total amount of the scholarship received by such recipient under this section; and

“(bb) the interest on such amounts which would be payable if at the time the scholarship was received such scholarship was a loan bearing interest at the maximum legally prevailing rate;

“(13) provide an annual report to Congress on the activities carried out under paragraphs (10), (11), and (12); and”;

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **ALASKA NATIVE-SERVING INSTITUTION.**—The term ‘Alaska Native-serving institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 317 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059d).

“(2) **ASIAN AMERICAN AND NATIVE AMERICAN PACIFIC ISLANDER-SERVING INSTITUTION.**—The term ‘Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-serving institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 320 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059g).

“(3) **HAWAIIAN NATIVE-SERVING INSTITUTION.**—The term ‘Hawaiian native-serving institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 317 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059d).

“(4) **HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTION.**—The term ‘Hispanic-serving institution’ has the meaning given that term in section 502 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101a).

“(5) **HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.**—The term ‘historically Black college or university’ has the meaning given the term ‘part B institution’ in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061(2)).

“(6) **TRIBAL COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.**—The term ‘Tribal College or University’ has the meaning given that term in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)).”.

(b) **JOINT INTERAGENCY ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT TO CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1907(a)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 596a(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) the Director of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office and each of the relevant departments that are partners in the National Technical Forensics Center—

“(i) include, as part of the assessments, evaluations, and reviews required under this paragraph, each office's or department's activities and investments in support of nuclear forensics and attribution activities and specific goals and objectives accomplished during the previous year pursuant to the national strategic five-year plan for improving the nuclear forensic and attribution capabilities of the United States required under section 1036 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010;

“(ii) attach, as an appendix to the Joint Interagency Annual Review, the most current version of such strategy and plan; and

“(iii) includes a description of new or amended bilateral and multilateral agreements and efforts in support of nuclear forensics and attribution activities accomplished during the previous year.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. CLARKE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 730.

H.R. 730, the Nuclear Forensics and Attribution Act, was first introduced in the 110th Congress by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

To strengthen our Nation's ability to prepare for and to respond to a conventional nuclear or dirty bomb threat, that measure, H.R. 2631, was marked up and adopted unanimously by the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology in October 2007, which is the subcommittee I now chair.

It was unanimously approved by the full Committee on Homeland Security on May 20, 2008, and in the House of Representatives on June 18, 2008. Though the measure was taken up, amended and passed by the Senate in late September, the stars didn't align, and it didn't clear the last hurdle to arrive on the President's desk. In this Congress, we started early and brought the measure directly to the floor where it passed on March 24, 2009. Now the Senate has acted, and it is time to pass this bill into law.

I would like to congratulate Congressman SCHIFF and my colleagues on the committee for recognizing the need to move quickly.

We know that our enemies, both terrorists and rogue nations, are interested in developing and using nuclear or radiological weapons. In the case of an attempted or, heaven forbid, a successful nuclear or radiological attack, rapid attribution is critical. Our government must have the capacity to quickly determine the source of the nuclear material so that key decision-makers have the information needed to respond.

The deterrent effect of a robust nuclear forensics capability should not be underestimated. Certainly, if terrorists know that we have a nuclear forensics capability that can pinpoint their role in creating a bomb, they are bound to have second thoughts. Unfortunately, today, the U.S. must rely on forensic expertise and technology developed during the Cold War to address both nuclear weapons and the emerging threat of a radiological dirty bomb.

The nuclear weapons workforce is aging just as its mission has shifted from traditional deterrent policy to the more complicated challenge of containing the terrorist threat. Our Nation's capabilities in the scientific fields of radiochemistry and geochemistry must be fostered to meet this new threat. That is the purpose of this bill. H.R. 730 expresses the sense of Congress that the President should pursue international agreements and develop protocols to share sensitive information needed to identify the source of a nuclear detonation.

I am heartened that the Obama administration has indicated its willingness to engage in and to reenergize such activities.

It also tasks the Secretary of Homeland Security with the mission of developing methods to attribute nuclear or radiological material both within

the Department's Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, DNDO, and in partnership with other Federal agencies.

The legislation emphasizes that the development of a robust nuclear forensics capability depends chiefly on an expertly trained workforce in this area, and it provides support for education programs relevant to nuclear forensics.

H.R. 730 also authorizes the National Technical Nuclear Forensics Center, NTNFC, to enhance the centralized planning and integration of Federal nuclear forensics activities. It requires the Secretary to report annually to Congress on the Federal Government's efforts to enhance its nuclear forensics capabilities, including the status of workforce development programs; and it authorizes \$30 million per year for the next 3 fiscal years for this effort.

H.R. 730 continues the Homeland Security Committee's practice of authorizing programs and offices within DHS that are of value to the agency's mission in order to assure that the work can continue and that progress can be achieved in the years to come.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, again, let me thank Congresswoman CLARKE for her leadership on this. Let me also thank Ranking Member DAN LUNGREN for his work.

Let me especially thank Mr. SCHIFF for his efforts on this and for so many other efforts on behalf of our national security. I have the privilege of serving with Mr. SCHIFF on the Intelligence Committee, so I have firsthand knowledge of the dedication which he brings to issues such as this.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 730. Let me just say that, in many ways, this is the other side of the same coin. We just adopted H.R. 2611, which is to prevent nuclear attacks against our cities. H.R. 730 will enable us to detect where those nuclear devices came from. It's absolutely essential that we deal with the process of determining the source of confiscated nuclear material. This is a grave, grave threat to our homeland, and it must be addressed immediately and robustly. We must have a rigorous attribution program to find the culprits of these crimes and to offer a deterrent to nuclear terrorism.

The one concern I do have is that the bill, as amended, coming back from the Senate does not authorize the appropriation of \$30 million. I believe that is important. It is essential that we have it; but, again, this is a major step forward, so I am pleased to support the legislation even though I wish that the \$30 million had been included in it.

This bill targets an ongoing threat in a unique way. It will reinvigorate the workforce pipeline to guarantee the Nation a resource of technical experts in this vital and critical field, and it

will strengthen America's attribution capabilities.

Again, this is a bipartisan effort. It's the Homeland Security Committee working with Mr. SCHIFF and the Intelligence Committee. It is important that we pass this and that we really, again, send a strong signal of how we do believe in layered defenses, of how we realize the need of staying ahead of the terrorist threat and of doing all we can to protect the American people in a way which certainly transcends Republican or Democrat lines or liberal-conservative lines. It is an issue that should galvanize all Americans.

So, with that, I strongly urge support of H.R. 730.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the author of this bill.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, at the outset, I want to thank and congratulate the Homeland Security Committee and Chairman THOMPSON. The committee has taken an important step forward towards preventing nuclear terrorism by persevering with this legislation, and I appreciate all of the hard work that the chairman and staff have put into it.

I also want to thank other Members who have contributed greatly to the effort, one being the ranking member, PETER KING.

Mr. KING, once again, I thank you for your leadership in this area.

I want to thank the former chairman of the Emerging Threats Subcommittee, an early supporter, JIM LANGEVIN; the current chairwoman of that subcommittee, YVETTE CLARKE; as well as the ranking member of the subcommittee, DAN LUNGREN; and in the last Congress, MICHAEL MCCAUL.

The Nuclear Forensics and Attribution Act will help us fight one of the most important national security threats we face, that of nuclear proliferation. Countries around the world now have access to technology that was once the realm of the few; and dangerous nuclear materials are, unfortunately, sprinkled around the world. This is not a new problem. Illicit nuclear material has been intercepted in transit out of the former Soviet Union many times since the end of the Cold War, and the material we catch is surely only a small fraction of the total amount trafficked.

Last year, Graham Allison wrote in *Newsweek* that the only thing that could keep nuclear bombs out of the hands of terrorists is a brand-new science of nuclear forensics. He continued that the key to a new deterrent is coming up with some way of tracing the nuclear material backward from an explosion in New York City to the reactor that forged the fissile material, even to the mines that yielded the original uranium ore.

The Nuclear Forensics and Attribution Act is designed to do just that. It is aimed at the decision-makers in

North Korea, Pakistan, Iran or elsewhere who could sell nuclear material, as well as the smugglers and corrupt officials around the world who could steal it. Those parts of the nuclear network can be deterred by the knowledge that, if their material is later intercepted, the United States will find out and will hold them responsible.

This bill expands our ability to determine the source of nuclear material by authorizing the National Technical Nuclear Forensics Center in the Department of Homeland Security. This center will coordinate the various agencies, and it will ensure an efficient combined response when nuclear material is intercepted or used, God forbid, in a weapon. It will also advance the science of nuclear forensics, bringing in new radiochemists and physicists to rejuvenate a rapidly aging workforce and funding research on new methods to identify materials. It also takes an important step toward building the nuclear forensic database we will need to effectively track nuclear material.

The bill asks the President to negotiate agreements with other nations to share forensic data on their nuclear materials, both civilian and military.

This effort is vital, and the National Technical Nuclear Forensics Center must play a key role in negotiations to ensure that the data we obtain is the data we need for quick attribution and response.

□ 1400

Nuclear terrorism is an indistinct threat of devastating consequence and therefore difficult to guard against. But as communications and transportation revolutions bring us ever closer to our allies, they bring our enemies close as well. I believe this bill will help make sure that our ability to prevent a nuclear terror attack keeps up with our enemies' ability to attempt one.

Again, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for their leadership and urge all Members to support the bill.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I would like to close by stating that all of us realize that a terrorist attack is a nightmare scenario.

The fact that we came so close to the loss of life on Christmas Day reminded us dramatically of the dangerous world in which we live. Those of us from New York will never forget September 11, 2001. But just think of the ultimate nightmare scenario, and that would be a nuclear attack. That is almost beyond our imagination. That is why everything must be done to stop those attacks, and to also have the deterrent, as Congressman SCHIFF said, the deterrent of retaliation against any country, against any entity, against any individual, any organization, which was in any way involved in providing nuclear weaponry to be used against the United States.

I strongly urge the adoption of this legislation.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I would encourage my colleagues to vote "aye" on the pending question. Doing so will allow this important homeland security legislation to be sent to the President's desk for his signature without delay.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 730.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

ordering the previous question on H.R. 1017, by the yeas and nays;  
adoption of H.R. 1017, if ordered;  
motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 3726, by the yeas and nays;  
motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 3538, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3254, TAOS PUEBLO INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT; FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3342, AAMODT LITIGATION SETTLEMENT ACT; AND FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1065, WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1017, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 175, not voting 19, as follows:

Ackerman	Green, Gene	Oberstar
Adler (NJ)	Grijalva	Obey
Andrews	Gutierrez	Oliver
Arcuri	Hall (NY)	Ortiz
Baca	Halvorson	Owens
Baird	Hare	Pallone
Baldwin	Harman	Pascarell
Barrow	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Bean	Heinrich	Payne
Becerra	Herseth Sandlin	Perlmutter
Berkley	Higgins	Perriello
Berman	Himes	Peters
Berry	Hinchey	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Hirono	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Hodes	Polis (CO)
Blumenauer	Holden	Pomeroy
Bocieri	Holt	Price (NC)
Boren	Honda	Quigley
Boswell	Hoyer	Rahall
Boucher	Inslee	Rangel
Boyd	Israel	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Richardson
Braley (IA)	Jackson Lee	Rodriguez
Bright	(TX)	Ross
Brown, Corrine	Johnson (GA)	Rothman (NJ)
Butterfield	Kagen	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Kanjorski	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Kaptur	Rush
Cardoza	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Carnahan	Kildee	Salazar
Carney	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sanchez, Linda
Carson (IN)	Kilroy	T.
Castor (FL)	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Chandler	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Sarbanes
Childers	Kissell	Schakowsky
Chu	Klein (FL)	Schauer
Clarke	Kosmas	Schiff
Clay	Kucinich	Schrader
Clyburn	Langevin	Schwartz
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott (GA)
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Cooper	Levin	Sestak
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Shea-Porter
Costello	Lipinski	Sherman
Courtney	Loebach	Sires
Crowley	Lowey	Skelton
Cuellar	Lujan	Slaughter
Cummings	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Dahlkemper	Maffei	Snyder
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Space
Davis (IL)	Markey (CO)	Speier
Davis (TN)	Markey (MA)	Spratt
DeFazio	Marshall	Stupak
DeGette	Massa	Sutton
Delahunt	Matheson	Tanner
DeLauro	Matsui	Teague
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McDermott	Tierney
Doyle	McGovern	Titus
Driehaus	McIntyre	Tonko
Edwards (MD)	McMahon	Towns
Edwards (TX)	McNerney	Tsongas
Ellison	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen
Ellsworth	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Engel	Melancon	Visclosky
Eshoo	Michaud	Walz
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Farr	Miller, George	Schultz
Fattah	Mollohan	Waters
Filner	Moore (KS)	Watson
Foster	Moore (WI)	Watt
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Waxman
Fudge	Murphy (CT)	Weiner
Garamendi	Murphy (NY)	Welch
Giffords	Murtha	Wilson (OH)
Gonzalez	Nadler (NY)	Woolsey
Gordon (TN)	Napolitano	Wu
Grayson	Neal (MA)	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Nye	

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—239

NAYS—175

Cole  
Conaway  
Davis (KY)  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Donnelly (IN)  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
Fallin  
Flake  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Fox (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves  
Griffith  
Guthrie  
Hall (TX)  
Harper  
Hastings (WA)  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hill  
Hunter  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan (OH)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston

Kirk  
Kline (MN)  
Kratovil  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee (NY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Morrison  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Minnick  
Mitchell  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy, Tim  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Olson  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Pence  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Posey

Price (GA)  
Putnam  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souders  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Turner  
Upton  
Walden  
Wamp  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—19

Abercrombie  
Barrett (SC)  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Cleaver  
Crenshaw  
Culberson

Davis (AL)  
Hinojosa  
Hoekstra  
Inglis  
Johnson, E. B.  
Lewis (CA)  
Lofgren, Zoe

Murphy, Patrick  
Radanovich  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Stark  
Young (AK)

□ 1429

Messrs. POSEY, JONES, and SMITH of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 9 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# CASTLE NUGENT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3726, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3726, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 173, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—241

Ackerman  
Adler (NJ)  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boccieri  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Childers  
Chu  
Clarke  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Dahlkemper  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (TN)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Driehaus  
Edwards (MD)  
Edwards (TX)  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Foster  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Giffords  
Gonzalez  
Gordon (TN)  
Grayson  
Green, Al

Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Halvorson  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Hereth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Himes  
Hinchee  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
Kilroy  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
Kissell  
Klein (FL)  
Kosmas  
Kratovil  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loebbeck  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney  
Markey (CO)  
Markey (MA)  
Marshall  
Massa  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McMahon  
McNerney  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Minnick  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murtha  
Nadler (NY)  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)

Nye  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarella  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Perriello  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis (CO)  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schauer  
Schiff  
Schradner  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Taylor  
Teague  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

NAYS—173

Aderholt  
Alexander  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Biggert  
Billbray  
Billirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner

Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bright  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)

Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Cao  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castle  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Davis (KY)  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
Fallin  
Flake  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foss  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves  
Griffith  
Guthrie  
Hall (TX)  
Harper  
Hastings (WA)  
Heller  
Hensarling

Herger  
Hunter  
Inglis  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan (OH)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline (MN)  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee (NY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mitchell  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy (NY)  
Murphy, Tim  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Olson  
Owens  
Paul

Paulsen  
Pence  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Putnam  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souders  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Turner  
Upton  
Walden  
Wamp  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—19

Abercrombie  
Akin  
Barrett (SC)  
Bonner  
Cleaver  
Crenshaw  
Culberson

Davis (AL)  
Hare  
Hinojosa  
Hoekstra  
Johnson, E. B.  
Lewis (CA)  
Murphy, Patrick

Radanovich  
Space  
Stark  
Wilson (OH)  
Young (AK)

□ 1444

Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

# MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and in Afghanistan and their families, and all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. RICHARDSON). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

IDAHO WILDERNESS WATER  
RESOURCES PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3538, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3538, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 191, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—225

Aderholt	Ellsworth	Lummis
Alexander	Emerson	Lungren, Daniel E.
Altmire	Fallin	Mack
Arcuri	Flake	Manzullo
Austria	Fleming	Marchant
Bachmann	Forbes	Marshall
Bachus	Fortenberry	Massa
Bartlett	Fox	McCarthy (CA)
Barton (TX)	Franks (AZ)	McCaul
Berkley	Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Biggert	Gallely	McCotter
Bilbray	Garrett (NJ)	McHenry
Bilirakis	Gerlach	McIntyre
Bishop (UT)	Giffords	McKeon
Blackburn	Gingrey (GA)	McMorris
Blunt	Gohmert	Rodgers
Bocieri	Gonzalez	Meeks (NY)
Boehner	Goodlatte	Mica
Bono Mack	Granger	Michaud
Boozman	Graves	Miller (FL)
Boucher	Griffith	Miller (MI)
Boustany	Guthrie	Miller (NC)
Boyd	Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary
Bright	Harper	Miller, George
Brown (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Minnick
Brown (SC)	Heller	Mitchell
Brown-Waite,	Hensarling	Moore (KS)
Ginny	Herger	Moran (KS)
Buchanan	Himes	Moran (VA)
Burgess	Hinchey	Murphy (CT)
Burton (IN)	Hodes	Murphy (NY)
Buyer	Hunter	Murphy, Tim
Calvert	Inglis	Murtha
Camp	Issa	Myrick
Campbell	Jenkins	Nadler (NY)
Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Neugebauer
Cao	Johnson, Sam	Nunes
Capito	Jones	Nye
Carney	Jordan (OH)	Olson
Carter	King (IA)	Pascarell
Cassidy	King (NY)	Paulsen
Castle	Kingston	Pence
Chaffetz	Kirk	Petri
Childers	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Pitts
Coble	Kissell	Platts
Coffman (CO)	Kline (MN)	Poe (TX)
Cohen	Kosmas	Pomeroy
Cole	Kratovil	Posey
Conaway	Kucinich	Price (GA)
Cuellar	Lamborn	Putnam
Davis (CA)	Lance	Rehberg
Davis (KY)	Larsen (WA)	Reichert
Deal (GA)	Latham	Richardson
Dent	LaTourette	Roe (TN)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Latta	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lee (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Dicks	Lipinski	Rogers (MI)
Donnelly (IN)	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher
Dreier	Loebach	Rooney
Driehaus	Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan	Lucas	Roskam
Ehlers	Luetkemeyer	

Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schrader  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster

Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Space  
Speier  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Tanner  
Taylor  
Teague  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)

Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Titus  
Turner  
Upton  
Visclosky  
Walden  
Wamp  
Whitfield  
Wilson (OH)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Young (FL)

NAYS—191

Ackerman  
Adler (NJ)  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Clarke  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Dahlkemper  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (TN)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards (MD)  
Edwards (TX)  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Foster  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gordon (TN)  
Grayson

NOT VOTING—17

Abercrombie  
Akin  
Barrett (SC)  
Bonner  
Cleaver  
Crenshaw

Culberson  
Davis (AL)  
Hinojosa  
Hoekstra  
Johnson, E. B.  
Lewis (CA)

Murphy, Patrick  
Radanovich  
Stark  
Westmoreland  
Young (AK)

□ 1456

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER  
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4191

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a sponsor of H.R. 4191.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken tomorrow.

□ 1500

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO  
HAITI

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1021) expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake of January 12, 2010.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1021

Whereas on January 12, 2010, a 7.0 magnitude earthquake struck the country of Haiti;

Whereas according to the United States Geological Survey (USGS) the earthquake epicenter was located approximately 10 miles southwest of the capital, Port-au-Prince;

Whereas the earthquake has been followed by dangerous aftershocks, including two of 5.9 and 5.5 magnitude, and with the most severe to date, at 6.1, coming on January 20, 2010;

Whereas casualty estimates, still being compiled, as well as infrastructure damage, including to roads, ports, hospitals, and residential dwellings, place this earthquake as the worst cataclysm to hit Haiti in over two centuries;

Whereas an estimated 3,000,000 people have been directly affected by the disaster in Haiti, nearly one-third of the country's population, who are currently at risk of long-term displacement and vulnerability;

Whereas the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH) headquarters collapsed with approximately 150 staff members inside, including the head of the mission, Hedi Annabi, causing the largest loss of life in United Nations history;

Whereas an unknown number of individuals remain trapped under collapsed buildings, as rescue teams work around-the-clock to locate and extract survivors;

Whereas the destruction of infrastructure, particularly to the port, airport, roads, and telecommunications, continues to hinder the immediate delivery of humanitarian assistance in Haiti;

Whereas Haiti is the poorest, least developed country in the Western Hemisphere,

and prior to the earthquake was ranked 149 out of 182 countries on the United Nations Human Development Index;

Whereas prior to the earthquake, Haiti was still in the process of recovering from a ruinous recent series of hurricanes and tropical storms, food shortages and rising commodity prices, and political instability, but was showing encouraging signs of improvement;

Whereas in addition to the pressure to secure communities and prevent looters from causing further harm to their citizens who are struggling to recover, Haiti's penitentiary collapsed and spilled untold numbers of criminals into an already disturbing security situation;

Whereas a number of children legally confirmed as orphans are eligible for inter-country adoption, and the uncertain welfare of children who are already in the process of being adopted is of urgent concern to their prospective adoptive parents in the United States;

Whereas it is in the interests of these orphans and their prospective adoptive parents to facilitate and expedite legal adoptions of Haitian orphans to the United States;

Whereas President Obama vowed the "unwavering support" of the United States and pledged a "swift, coordinated and aggressive effort to save lives and support the recovery in Haiti";

Whereas the response to the tragedy from the global community has been overwhelmingly positive;

Whereas the initial emergency response of the men and women of the United States Government, led by the United States Agency for International Development and United States Southern Command, has been swift and resolute;

Whereas MINUSTAH peacekeepers, while still trying to rescue their colleagues in their headquarters, have taken a leading role to assist in clearing roads and providing security around Port-au-Prince to facilitate aid into the earthquake disaster zone;

Whereas the United States Department of Homeland Security has temporarily halted the deportation of Haitian nationals to Haiti in response to the devastation caused by the earthquake;

Whereas the United States Department of Homeland Security granted the designation of Temporary Protected Status for Haitian nationals who are in the United States and unable to return to their country due to the destruction and humanitarian crisis in Haiti;

Whereas individuals, businesses, and philanthropic organizations across the United States and throughout the international community have responded in support of Haiti and its populace during this time of crisis, sometimes in innovative ways such as fundraising through text messaging;

Whereas throughout this terrible calamity, the Haitian people continue to demonstrate unwavering resilience, dignity, and courage; and

Whereas once proper surveys and assessments are conducted, the initial and crucial emergency relief response will likely move to a comprehensive mission requiring sustained assistance from the United States and the international community for reconstruction and development efforts: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its deepest condolences and sympathy for the horrific loss of life and the physical and psychological damage caused by the earthquake of January 12, 2010;

(2) expresses solidarity with Haitians, Haitian Americans, and all those who have lost loved ones or have otherwise been affected by the tragedy, including United States Em-

bassy personnel, United Nations peacekeepers, and humanitarian workers;

(3) commends the efforts and honors the sacrifice of the men and women of the Government of Haiti, the United States Government, the United Nations, and the international community in their immediate response to those affected by this calamity;

(4) commends the efforts of the American people, including the Haitian-American community, to provide relief to families, friends, and unknown peoples suffering in the country;

(5) supports the efforts of the Administration to provide and coordinate international humanitarian assistance and to provide relief to affected communities;

(6) expresses support for the recovery and long-term reconstruction needs of Haiti;

(7) recognizes that the recovery and long-term needs of Haiti will require a sustained commitment by the United States and international community based on comprehensive assessments of the development needs for Haiti;

(8) urges those who hold debt against Haiti, including the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and all other regional and international institutions and countries, to immediately suspend further debt payments, and to develop processes to cancel all remaining debt; and

(9) urges the President—

(A) to continue to make available to United States agencies, nongovernmental organizations, private voluntary organizations, regional institutions, and United Nations agencies the resources necessary to confront the effects and consequences of this natural disaster;

(B) to provide, when the emergency subsidies, assistance in partnership with the Government of Haiti and in coordination with other donors to begin the reconstruction of Haiti;

(C) to undertake comprehensive assessments of the long-term needs for recovery and development in Haiti, ensure transparency and accountability, and lead coordination efforts with international actors who share in the goal of a better future for Haiti and are willing to support the costs of meeting those needs; and

(D) to utilize new and innovative thinking in providing long-term assistance to Haiti, including tapping into the insight and immense potential of the Haitian Diaspora, to help Haitians rebuild upon the strongest possible foundation, in order to promote a stable and sustainable future for Haiti.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution which expresses our deep condolences and sol-

idarity with the people of Haiti, and all of those who have lost loved ones or have otherwise been affected by the tragic earthquake of January 12, 2010.

Let me first thank our Speaker, Chairman BERMAN, Chairman PAYNE and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for helping to bring this resolution to the floor today. Also I want to express my deep gratitude to our staffs for working on this to make sure that the resolution came forward today. I would also like to recognize my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus.

The CBC has a long history of working with the Haitian people and the Haitian American community and the Haitian Government. And many of us have traveled to that country many, many times. During the current crisis, the CBC has and will continue to work closely with the Obama administration and outside organizations to provide whatever assistance is needed for ongoing relief and recovery efforts. And I am very proud of the fact that each and every member of the Congressional Black Caucus has signed on as original cosponsors of this resolution.

More than a week has passed since the 7.0 earthquake. Again, many aftershocks, just today another 6.1 aftershock, which has devastated the country of Haiti. We have all seen the horrific images, and our hearts are heavy for the Haitian people and all of those affected by this tragedy. An estimated 3 million people have been directly affected by this catastrophe, leaving over 1 million homeless, and many at risk of long-term displacement and vulnerability.

The latest figures estimate 200,000 people may have been killed as a result of this disaster. The massive number of casualties, as well as the extensive infrastructure damage, including to roads, ports, hospitals, residential dwellings, marks this earthquake as the worst natural disaster to strike Haiti in over two centuries.

Currently, our government is engaged now in one of our largest humanitarian relief efforts in our history. To date, USAID has provided \$100 million to Haiti for relief efforts, and more is likely on the way. So I have to commend at this time the men and women of the Government of Haiti, of our own government, of our Armed Services, the United Nations, the international community, our NGOs, our neighbors in the Caribbean and Latin America, and throughout the world in their immediate response to assist those affected by this calamity.

We continue to work around the clock to provide as much food, water, and emergency health care as possible under these unimaginable circumstances. So it is important that these emergency supplies be expedited, and not caught up in bureaucratic hurdles. The same goes for many relief and rescue organizations trying to evacuate survivors for emergency care. The red tape must be cut to save as many lives as possible.



Let me applaud the Haitian American community for providing relief to family and friends and the entire country. Also I have to praise the efforts of the American people at large, who have once again demonstrated their compassion by providing aid to people they have never met, never met, but who are suffering nonetheless just miles off our shore.

This resolution summarizes the unfortunate facts that have occurred in Haiti, but also, in addition to supporting the efforts of the Haitian people and being in solidarity with the Haitian Government and the Haitian people at this point during this rescue and recovery phase, this resolution also recognizes, in a bipartisan way, support for the recovery and long-term reconstruction of Haiti, and also recognizes that the recovery and long-term needs of Haiti will require a sustained commitment, mind you a sustained commitment by the United States and the international community, based on a comprehensive strategy based on what the Haitian people and the Government of Haiti have deemed necessary and required for their full recovery and reconstruction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today proudly as the lead Republican sponsor of House Resolution 1021, expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake on January 12, 2010. Last week Haiti was hit by the largest earthquake to strike that Nation in over two centuries. Today Haiti was affected by a 6.1 magnitude quake or aftershock.

When the original quake hit last week, it was a day like any other. With elections on the horizon, a sense of stability slowly starting to be felt on the island, some believed that things were finally starting to look up for Haiti. And then without a warning tens of thousands were suddenly victims. Millions were left homeless, or hungry, or both. Buildings collapsed, countless disappeared, and the world was left asking how and why. The tremendous loss caused by this tragedy will stay with us long after the roads have been cleared and the physical wounds have healed.

My most sincere prayers and thoughts go to all who have been impacted by this horrible catastrophe. The desolation left in its wake is beyond words. And yet there is one thing that has been made clear. The people of Haiti are not alone in this trouble. Since news of the earthquake reached our shores, the American people have opened their hearts and their wallets to help earthquake-ravaged Haiti. Both through the many donations of money, food and water, volunteer work, and through the U.S. agencies providing disaster relief assistance, our Nation has been working around the clock to

provide immediate help to all who have been affected by this horrific tragedy.

U.S. Coast Guard aircraft began arriving almost immediately to transport injured persons and conduct aerial assessments of the situation on the ground. Coast Guard cutters with medical and other humanitarian supplies arrived soon after, followed by our USAID Disaster Assistance Response Team, multiple U.S. urban search and rescue teams, including two from my area of Miami-Dade County, the 82nd Airborne Division and Marine contingency, emergency medical teams and food assistance, and of course the remarkable contributions made by private U.S. citizens and corporations, totaling over \$40 million as of last week and still growing.

In addition, we have seen an outpouring of support from countries and people around the world. Among many steps taken by countries around the world, Israel sent a 220-person medical delegation and set up a much-needed field hospital. The European Union has reportedly pledged 200 million euros to help rebuild Haiti, over and above emergency aid that is already being sent by them. The British Government will triple its aid to Haiti to \$10 million.

Israel quickly set up a full-service field hospital, as I mentioned before. But let me tell you, Madam Speaker, what it was equipped with: operating rooms, an intensive care ward, a maternity ward, a pediatrics ward, incubator units, a pharmacy, x-ray equipment, 10 tons of medical equipment, 90 beds, 66 intensive care beds, two delivery beds, approximately 250 personnel, including 40 doctors and specialists, 20 nurses, and several paramedics.

The search and rescue teams of the Israeli Defense Forces were also quickly deployed to Haiti, and include about 30 operators, and dozens of operations personnel, comprising logistics, information technology, communications, and even canine units. More IDF delegations are scheduled to depart to Haiti this very week.

As a result, this resolution importantly calls for certain accountability measures to be put into place in order to ensure that the support is delivered in a way that is immediate, that is targeted, that is coordinated, and that is transparent.

Now more than ever it is critical that our assistance go where it is supposed to go, when it is supposed to get there, and how it is supposed to get there. We have a responsibility to the people we represent and to the people we wish to help to ensure that the aid reaches its intended recipients and is used for its intended purposes. This is particularly important moving forward.

Again, I extend my most heartfelt condolences to all of those who are impacted by this series of earthquakes, and I reiterate the pride I feel as I look at how the American people, our constituents, have responded to the cries of anguish and the cries for help of the Haitian people.

Madam Speaker, with that I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my colleague from California.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, expressing my condolences on the situation in Haiti and praising Fairfax County's urban search and rescue team that is in Haiti, 80-strong plus, and having saved a number of lives already.

In the aftermath of the 7.0 magnitude earthquake that struck Haiti, the men and women of these highly skilled teams worked together in a chaotic environment to save fifteen people (as of Tues. Jan 19).

On January 12, 2010—one day after the devastating earthquake that struck Haiti—the men and women of Fairfax County's urban search and rescue team, Virginia Task Force 1, deployed to Haiti.

The task force consisted of 72 personnel, 6 search and rescue canines, and about 48 tons of rescue equipment and supplies. The team rescued a United Nations security guard and assisted a French search and rescue team in removing seven Americans from a hotel.

Two days after the earthquake, a second team of 42 men and women from Fairfax County deployed to Haiti. Both Fairfax County urban search and rescue teams merged and rescued a 21 year-old female who was trapped in a multi-story building.

I commend the men and women of USAR Team 1 on their heroic effort, mourn for those who lost their lives, and pray for those awaiting aid. To the Fairfax team and all first responders in Haiti, I say "Stay Safe" and "Go with God."

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I would now like to yield such time as he may consume to the Chair of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa and Global Affairs, also the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus's International Affairs Task Force, a real leader who has worked on Haiti all of his life, Congressman DONALD PAYNE from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much. And let me thank the Chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus for the outstanding job that she has done in this whole effort, Chairman BERMAN, Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN, and all of those who have come to show their support and what they have been doing up to now and what we intend to do in the future.

Madam Speaker, I rise to extend my deepest condolences to the people of Haiti, Haitian Americans, and all of those who have been affected by the earthquake that hit Port-au-Prince on Tuesday, January 12.

Words certainly cannot describe the pain and psychological trauma of the tragedy and its cause, and there is no way that we can just envision the tragic loss of life from this devastating 7.0 Richter scale earthquake.

The other thing about the earthquake is that it was only 6 miles below the surface, which many earthquakes go as far as 100, 150 miles down. So the trauma of this earthquake was just totally devastating. Actually, we have had several aftershocks, a 5.9 and a 5.5. We had another one today of 6.1 on the Richter scale. So this is far from over.

□ 1515

It has been estimated that over 3 million people have been directly affected by the disaster in Haiti. Nearly one-third of the country's population is at risk for long-term displacement and vulnerability, not to forget the unknown numbers of individuals who remain trapped in collapsed buildings.

I want to thank the rescue teams, the nongovernmental organizations, and other emergency responders who are working around the clock to locate and extract survivors. I certainly commend the efforts of the humanitarian response that is currently underway, particularly the efforts of all persons and relief organizations. Donors so far have contributed over \$220 million to this effort. And by simply texting on phones, \$22 million has been raised at \$5 and \$10 a clip. This is really showing the great heart of the American people. Even today, the Dominican Republic just announced \$2.5 million that they are donating, and as you know that is a country that struggles financially themselves.

The disaster was a tremendous setback. Haiti was starting to move into a new beginning, and we now will see many of the problems of high food prices and food shortages that have been caused by this natural disaster. We certainly need to really remain very committed to this community at this very difficult time.

Haiti has a longstanding history with the United States. We heard the charge today talk about Haiti and its relationship to the United States. It fought for the independence of our country. It was responsible for Napoleon selling the Louisiana Territory to the United States because they were cash-poor after the war that they lost. The whole question of Lewis and Clark was able to move forward.

And so we are intertwined with Haiti. We have a great deal of connection with Haiti. Once again, I would like to certainly praise the chairperson of the CBC. And let me correct, the Democratic Republic of Congo was the country that had recently made the contribution; even more spectacular because of the tremendous problems that we have seen there.

We wish to say to President Preval, who is doing everything that he can, and the Haiti Government, that we will work as partners with them. This is just the beginning. We are going to stay involved with them until we see a completion of what they need.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am so pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman

from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), an esteemed member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentlewoman.

I wanted to rise in support of this resolution, but I also wanted to commend those who are involved in the rescue effort and the international communities, the governments, and the nongovernmental organizations, as well as the private rescue teams who have been on the ground.

I also want to give high marks to those people who had already been down in Haiti. One of them is Pastor Freddie Hebron from Savannah, Georgia, whose church has an ongoing missionary down there. Pastor Hebron was actually unaccounted for for about 38 hours, and the community was very concerned about him, but he is okay. He is still down there, although communication with him is a little bit spotty.

We also had another group, Pastor Bowman with Islands Church of Christ, who is down there led by Dr. John Rowlett and Dr. Brian Kornblatt, 14 American citizens who were down there and located outside of Port-au-Prince when the earthquake hit. And yet from their area, they started immediately dispensing medicine to the victims of the earthquake, eventually ran out of medicine, and then were stuck in an area isolated from the American Embassy, about 25 miles. They were able to get let out of there on Saturday at somewhat great danger and peril to them because at that point the street situation was beginning to deteriorate, with gangs and mobs that were out there and a lot of chaos. Richard Towns, who is a former marine, was one in their group and was able to get inside the Embassy. Once they got near it, and after a number of other obstacles, this group was able to return home to Savannah, Georgia, on Saturday with lots of prayer.

However, sadly, we still have two constituents from my area of Georgia who are unaccounted for; one is Courtney Hayes, who is a college student with Lynn University. She is a native of Douglas, Georgia. And another is a businessman named David Apperson, who is from Adel, Georgia. Both of them were staying in the Hotel Montana. Hotel Montana has suffered many losses. The rescue crew has brought out eight people from Hotel Montana, but there are others who are believed to be still trapped inside there.

In a conference call with the families yesterday we were told that the search-and-rescue teams—and some are private, some are international, and some are American; one of them is from Florida, one is from Fairfax County, and one is from Los Angeles—they're doing everything they can with scope cameras and listening devices and dogs and so forth to try to find whatever cavities remain in this rubble and focus on those areas where somebody could

be trapped and surviving. The cavity question is actually more important right now than food or water, and so they're focusing on that.

A major concern of the families is what happens when the Government of Haiti, which is what we were told yesterday, the Government of Haiti decides that there is no point in further looking for survivors at the Hotel Montana. What we're concerned about as Americans is that we should make that decision, not the Haitian Government. I have written a letter today to the President, along with Congressman ROONEY and Congressman MICA, who also have constituents in there, to not call off that search because we believe it is very important that the American Government do everything that it can for the Haitians and the other international citizens, but also do everything we can foremost for Americans who are down there who are unaccounted for.

So I would ask that formally of my colleagues—that Hotel Montana we know has some American citizens trapped in there, we do not know their condition, I hope that other Members of Congress will join me in calling for that search to continue. I also would call on the administration to do that, and commend the good work that they are doing all around and realize the challenge ahead of them. But my concern right now is the Hotel Montana. And I would ask for your prayers for Courtney Hayes, a college student, and David Apperson, who is a businessman from Georgia, who are both down there and still unaccounted for.

With that, I commend you in support of this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. I would like to yield 1 minute now to our majority leader, Representative HOYER from the great State of Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and congratulate her for her leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus and her service on the Appropriations Committee, and for the focus that she brings to making sure that we do not forget those who are less fortunate than we.

We all join together in expressing our sorrow over last week's earthquake, which shattered the lives of so many of the people in Haiti, and as has been mentioned, others who were visiting Haiti. I do so fully knowing that no words we say here can rebuild a collapsed home or heal the wounds of the living or bury the dead.

At times like these, we say words fail; they fail to capture the true scope of devastation and suffering, and they fail to effect any change for the better. Nevertheless, it is still important to express the responsibility we feel to the 3 million Haitians killed, injured or displaced by this disaster, the same responsibility we hope that others would feel toward us in a time of need. That is why America is joining with the

international community, NGOs, and the United Nations to provide disaster relief and aid in rebuilding. That is why President Obama has pledged \$100 million in disaster aid, and why American personnel are on the scene saving lives and aiding in the recovery.

The Los Angeles Daily News reported this week on the California firefighters whose backbreaking work gives us all something of which to be proud. I quote from that article: They were bone weary from digging through the rubble for 5 hours Sunday, losing faith fast. When the cheering began, it was like a shot of adrenalin, "USA, USA," the large Haitian crowd standing in the street yelled as Los Angeles County Fire Captain Bill Monahan and his search-dog rescue team finally freed a young woman trapped under her collapsed hotel for 5 days. "Bill said it brought him to tears," said Debra Tosch, who is the executive director of the Search Dog Foundation.

We know that there are stories of grief and loss to go alongside such stories of hope. We know that Haiti's crisis goes far deeper than the earthquake. But we also know that when our words fail in the face of a tragedy of this scope, it is our responsibility and our honor and our moral duty to act.

I urge the House to pass this resolution. I urge the Obama administration to give its urgent attention to coordinating and overseeing America's part in the relief effort. And then, when some degree of civility and stability has returned to that country, let us not forget that the road ahead will be long and difficult, but it is a necessary one if the Haitian people are to return to a life which will give them the kinds of opportunities and stability that we wish for ourselves.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank and applaud the American people for the generosity and the compassion they have shown in the wake of this horrific tragedy. According to our State Department, the American Red Cross effort has received over 2 million contributors and raised over \$23 million so far. In addition, we continue to see admirable contributions from many American corporations and businesses. My own district of Miami, Florida, has sent two urban search-and-rescue teams to Haiti and has pledged \$60,000 to relief efforts. The Port of Miami and Miami International Airport are waiving certain fees for relief-related efforts. Also, several other assets from south Florida are also being utilized, including U.S. Southern Command, or SOUTHCOM, which is serving as the operation center for the U.S. response in Haiti. Coast Guard Key West and Coast Guard Miami Beach, also Homestead Air Reserve Base, a departure point for the C-130s that are carrying relief, supplies, and personnel to Haiti, are playing an important role in this relief effort.

And just today, the USNS *Comfort* received its first Haitian patients, a 6-year-old boy and a 20-year-old man. They were flown via helicopter to the hospital ship. This is a nearly 900-foot floating hospital. The *Comfort* is reported to be carrying about 550 medical staff and about 60 civilian mariners.

So the American people have opened up their hearts and their wallets to help earthquake-ravaged Haiti. As a people and as a Nation, the United States will continue to move hand in hand with the people of Haiti to swiftly respond to and recover from this tragedy.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. I would like to now yield 1 minute to our great Speaker from the State of California, Speaker NANCY PELOSI.

□ 1530

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlewoman, Congresswoman LEE, for her leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor as Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus and as a leader on this issue as well.

To Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee, once again, thank you for your leadership.

DONALD PAYNE, our leader—my goodness, what a conscience he is and has been on this subject for a very long time and, really, for the alleviation of poverty and the eradication of disease throughout the world.

Madam Speaker, obviously the thoughts and prayers of this entire Congress are with the people of Haiti, who are suffering from a devastating earthquake that hit their country on January 12. Members of Congress are committed to helping the Haitian people recover from this tragedy and to rebuild their homes, communities and lives in the days, weeks and years to come.

Again, I thank Congresswoman LEE, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, and Congressman PAYNE for their leadership today and throughout the years in support of the people of Haiti.

It is a source of pride to the Americans that when President Obama spoke about this subject, he said to the Haitian people, "You will not be forsaken. You will not be forgotten."

What a beautiful sentiment reflecting the values of our country, the concern of the President, personally, that he had for the people of Haiti, the leadership he provided as Commander in Chief to deploy the forces necessary to help bring order there, and as President of the United States to speak with heads of state from other countries to coordinate the effort of relief for Haiti.

We are still learning the staggering extent of the devastation. The Government of Haiti estimates the death toll is close to 200,000 souls—200,000 people made in the image and likeness of God, 200,000 people whose families have been devastated by this loss. It's just such a

staggering snuffing out of life, and more than 1.5 million people homeless.

Anyone who has ever visited Haiti has seen the extreme poverty there, the poorest country in this hemisphere; but with the poverty that they have economically and with the hope that they have otherwise, anyone who has visited there can testify to the fact that the sparkle in their eyes and their hopes for the future and their love of their children and their love of life is very special. It stands out.

I've been to many countries to visit the poor and to see what our efforts nationally and globally are to alleviate poverty and eradicate disease; and in Haiti you see a sparkle that is so special, and that's why this seems so very, very sad. We know for certain that too many Haitians are suffering right now. Far too many are injured and hungry. Far too many grieve the loss of loved ones.

Again, I am proud of the swift coordinated response that the President had. He extended TPS, at long last, temporary protection status. We've been asking for that for a long time, long before President Obama was President, for Haitians living in the U.S., and it ensures that no one will be sent back against their will to the devastation. I talked earlier about the President's leadership in this regard. At this tragic time, we can take steps right away to ensure a brighter future for Haiti.

I do believe, as one who comes from earthquake country—California, where we've experienced earthquakes; right, Congresswoman?—that there is a possibility that Haiti can leapfrog over all the physical devastation there to an economy and a future that is so very bright that this can create a boom economy for the people there and make a big difference in their lives. This can only happen if we all help.

Already today, the House has passed bipartisan charitable tax deduction legislation to encourage and incentivize assistance from the American people to the people of Haiti. I hope the Senate will soon follow and send this bill to the President's desk.

Next, the International Development Bank should move forward with full debt cancellation for Haiti. International institutions should be removing obstacles to Haiti's enormous long-term reconstruction challenges, including providing the new assistance in the form of grants and not loans.

Third, I will be asking the appropriate committees to work together with the administration and the Haitian Government to see how Congress can support long-term sustainable development plans for Haiti; and aren't we fortunate that Congresswoman LEE serves on one of those appropriate committees, and the chairwoman is here, Congresswoman LOWEY, of the subcommittee that is so important to this.

A compassionate and generous response from the United States is essential to stabilizing Haiti. While there has been a strong initial response to

the crisis, there must be an initiative to provide sustainable assistance that empowers Haiti's institutions and the Haitian people to build a future that is better than the past.

We value the strong relationship between Haiti and the United States. Our countries share a long and difficult history in some respects, but that binds us together. Wherever Haiti immigrants have settled, they have thrived, and they have contributed to the welfare and the well-being of their new home country, never forgetting their Haitian legacy.

We know about the artistic genius and entrepreneurial spirit of the Haitian people—Michael Jong, are you listening?—as so many others. They will succeed if they are only given the opportunity. Today, with this resolution, we are saying to the Haitian people: In your hour of greatest need, America stands with you.

Again, I thank Congresswoman LEE for her leadership on this important issue and Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN as well.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the Chair of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on The Western Hemisphere, the gentleman from New York, Chairman ENGEL.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, as chairman of The Western Hemisphere Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 1021, which expresses condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the horrific and devastating earthquake of January 12.

It is with great sorrow that we come to the floor today to lament the catastrophic blow to Haiti from last week's natural disaster. Tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of people have died; and hundreds of thousands are homeless in the wake of the earthquake. Our hearts go out to the Haitian people as they cope with the calamity that has befallen their nation.

While we mourn the great loss of life in Haiti, we must resolve to stand with the Haitian people as they rebuild their lives. Due to my long experience with Haiti from hearings in my subcommittee, visiting the country and, most importantly, my relationship with my Haitian American constituents—I have a large Haitian American community in my district in Spring Valley, New York—I know that Haiti will overcome this tremendous adversity.

However, Haiti and its people will need U.S. and international help for the foreseeable future. It is reassuring to see that the Obama administration has quickly marshaled the resources of the U.S. Government in coordination with the international community.

I thank President Obama and Secretary Clinton for their tireless efforts.

It is also important to recognize the generosity of millions of private American citizens who have responded immediately to this crisis, and we must thank the dedicated U.S. military and government personnel and the thousands of NGO volunteers and staff for their truly valiant efforts.

We should also remember that the challenges faced by Haiti will continue past this immediate period and will extend into the long term. The U.S. and global community will need to offer robust assistance to make sure Haiti can rebuild from this shocking disaster.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to praise President Obama's decision to grant temporary protection status, or TPS, to Haitian nationals living in the U.S. Representative RANGEL and I led the New York congressional delegation in writing to President Obama in support of this TPS designation.

On behalf of my constituents and Haitian Americans around the country, I offer my gratitude to the President, and I urge my colleagues to do the same in supporting this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Before recognizing the next speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise to voice my condolences and pledge to stand in solidarity with Haiti.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution and to express my sincere condolences to the Haitian people and to their friends and family around the world, including Haitian-Americans living in my district. Throughout my time in Congress, I have worked with them on ways to improve the lives of Haitians, and I know we will continue that work together.

Last week's 7.0-magnitude earthquake was an almost unimaginable tragedy for Haiti. The capital city was flattened, tens of thousands of people were killed, and countless others lost what few possessions they had as homes, business, and schools crumbled.

I have traveled to Haiti several times, most recently last spring, and I am always struck by the incredible resilience of the Haitian people in the face of extreme poverty and devastating natural disasters. Still, this most recent tragedy is absolutely heartbreaking, particularly at a time when glimmers of light were beginning to appear for Haiti's future.

Emergency assistance in the coming days, weeks, and months will be critical. Earthquake survivors desperately need food, water, and medicine. But that cannot be the end of the story. Even before the earthquake, Haiti was the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere, with 80 percent of the population living on less than \$2 per day. In recent years Haiti has weathered serious food riots after rising prices forced parents to feed mudcakes to

their children, as well as a series of devastating storms.

So long as Haiti remains a country without a viable economy, it will remain dependent on assistance. We must continue to work to make sure that food, water, and medicine reach those who desperately need it right now, but, in the months and years ahead, we also need to work to bring real economic development to Haiti.

Madam Speaker, I extend my sincere condolences to the people of Haiti, and I join with my colleagues and the Obama administration in pledging U.S. support in the days, months, and years ahead.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I stand proudly with my colleagues in supporting H. Res. 1021, which extends our heartfelt condolences and support for the people of Haiti and for those who are there serving humanitarian relief.

This is an opportunity for us, in the midst of all this tragedy, to address one of the poorest nations in the world, and it is located in the Western Hemisphere. It is time for us not only to meet the emergent needs but to fulfill our commitment to this country from now on in perpetuity.

So I commend the speedy work of the Congressional Black Caucus, of all of the Members of this House, and of those on the other side of the aisle for addressing these needs and for collaborating with the world to bring the kind of relief that is needed for our neighbor to the south. Congratulations.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, also Chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the chairwoman very much, and I thank her for her leadership on this issue, joined with the chairman of the full committee and the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Chairman BERMAN; the Congressional Black Caucus; and so many Members who have issued their outpouring of support. I thank Chairman PAYNE for his continued efforts, and I thank all of the Members who have sizable populations of Haitians in their districts.

There is a very active Haitian American population in Houston, Texas. We have been working. We have been pouring out our hearts, but we've also rolled up our sleeves. I believe there are several issues, as we support this resolution, that should be focused on.

One, we must have a long-term response, a Marshall Plan, in essence, to help rebuild Haiti. Two, we must deal

with the immediate crisis, emergency, loss of life, loss of loved ones, the ability to have medical care, and, yes, protecting our offerings.

So my community met on this past Saturday with the county government, the State government, the city government, Mayor Annise Parker and her representatives, the fire department, and our National and Texas Reserve, committing ourselves the resources and assets to be able to be of assistance. I was delighted to have been able to send from Texas two plane-loads of doctors, nurses and medical supplies, led by Dr. Richard Toussaint, where this past weekend they were able to do 150 surgeries and 600 visits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. LEE of California. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 10 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Moving forward, we will focus on relief efforts for the children, providing more medical care and, yes, insisting on making sure that we rebuild this great city and this great nation. We can do this. We are standing by their side. We will not leave them alone.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1021—"Expressing Condolences to and Solidarity with the People of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating Earthquake of January 12th, 2010."

As you know, on Tuesday, January 12th, a massive, 7.0 magnitude earthquake struck Haiti near the capital of Port-au-Prince. There is still no official estimate of death or destruction but the damage to buildings is extensive and the number of injured or dead is estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands.

Haiti sits on a large fault that has caused catastrophic quakes in the past, but this one was described as among the most powerful to hit the region within the last 200 years. With many poor residents living in tin-roof shacks that sit precariously on steep ravines and with much of the construction in Port-au-Prince and elsewhere in the country of questionable quality, the expectation was that the quake caused major damage to buildings and significant loss of life.

The dimensions of the disaster are still unfolding, but Haiti's Prime Minister Jean-Max Bellerive told CNN that he believes there are well over 100,000 dead, and leading senator Youri Latortue estimated the number at possibly as high as 500,000, according the Associated Press.

America is responding, and will continue to respond with immediate humanitarian assistance to help the people of this struggling island nation rebuild their livelihoods. I send my condolences to the people and government of Haiti as they grieve once again in the aftermath of a natural disaster. As Haiti's neighbor, I believe it is the United States' responsibility to help Haiti recover, and build the capacity to mitigate against future disasters.

America and her allies have already initiated a comprehensive, interagency response to the earthquake. The State Department, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Coast Guard, USAID—all worked overnight to ensure critical resources were positioned to support the response and recovery effort, including efforts to find and assist American citizens in Haiti.

Within days of last week's devastating earthquake, U.S. Southern Command deployed a team of 30 people to Haiti to support U.S. relief efforts in the aftermath of one of the largest natural disasters in the western hemisphere. The team included U.S. military engineers, operational planners, and a command and control group and communication specialists arriving on two C-130 Hercules aircraft. Since, there has been a tremendous interagency response with support and partnering with U.S. Embassy personnel as well as Haitian, United Nations and international officials to assess the situation and facilitate follow-on U.S. military support.

Our friends in the international community must also be commended for their efforts. The United Nations is releasing \$10 million from its emergency funds. The European Commission has approved C3 million (\$4.37 million) with more funds likely. Countless other nations from Germany, to China, to Israel to Mexico to have also pledged support. I commend each of these nations for coming to our neighboring nation in dire need of assistance.

Many of my constituents have asked what they can do to help, or how they can find their loved ones. Those who are interested in helping immediately can text 'HAITI' to '90999' and a donation of \$10 will be made automatically to the Red Cross for relief efforts. The donation will be charged to your cell phone bill.

The outpouring of support and funding from the American people was both instant and sustained. According to the Washington Post, the text messaging effort raised \$5 million in its first day, breaking the previous one-day record of about \$450,000. Text-message donations continue to play a larger-than-expected role in the push for earthquake relief in Haiti. As of late Sunday, the American Red Cross said that it had collected pledges of about \$103 million, including \$22 million through the text donation program. Each donor should be proud of their contribution to help their brothers and sisters in Haiti.

Financially, 2009 was not an easy year for many Americans. Although thousands of jobs were created and we are back on the road to economic recovery, Americans lived on tighter budgets than usual. This legislation passed today will allow those Americans who have generously donated money to Haiti to receive their tax break this year instead of next year.

In January of 2005, Congress enacted this type of relief for individuals that made charitable contributions to victims of the Indian Ocean tsunami that occurred in late December of 2004. That bill (H.R. 241 in the 109th Congress) passed the House of Representatives without objection and subsequently passed the Senate by unanimous consent. I hope that this legislation, like our response to the 2004 tsunami, will encourage Americans to contribute more money to Haiti. As Haiti starts on its long recovery, every dollar is critically important. Americans have responded in great numbers, and I am proud to represent such a compassionate and generous nation.

Americans are not only giving their money, they are also giving their time and expertise as well. This weekend, I arranged for a team of seven doctors, six nurses, two techs, and two search and rescue volunteers to fly to Haiti and provide immediate humanitarian support. This team led by Dr. Richard Toussaint from Forest Park Medical Center in Dallas Texas arrived in Haiti just after noon on Satur-

day. From there, the doctors made their way to Hospital Sacre-Coeur where, in roughly two days, they performed about 70 amputations, surgically treated about 150 patients, and saw about 600 patients total. I commend this team of medical personnel for their selfless actions and willingness to spend their own time and money to come to the aid of people they had never met.

Additionally, I hosted a Houston-based Haiti relief effort called "Texans helping Haitians" with city leadership and the Haitian community in the aftermath of this horrible disaster. Groups included in the effort to provide supplies and medical assistance to Haiti were: Texas Medical Center, Texas Dental Association, Search and Rescue Organizations, the Haitian Multicultural Association, Haitian Caribbean Organization of Texas, Caribbean Impact Foundation, and Haiti Counts.

We also helped coordinate the safe return of six Houston Rotarians that were stranded in the mountains and we are now working with Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance on the transport of orphans to awaiting families here in the U.S.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have been highly involved in strengthening the relationship between the U.S. and Haiti. I have worked to establish positive and productive partnerships with local development officials, non-profit organizations, and the Haitian Diaspora to establish a strong web of support for the nation of Haiti. In collaboration with the Congressional Black Caucus, I have been a continual advocate of providing assistance to Haiti to strengthen their fragile democratic processes, continue to improve security, and promote economic development among other concerns such the protection of human rights, combating narcotics, arms, and human trafficking, addressing Haitian migration, and alleviating poverty.

Last year, I introduced H.R. 264, the "Save Immigration Comprehensive Act of 2009." Among other things, this act authorizes adjustment of status for certain nationals or citizens of Haiti as well as amends the Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act of 1998 to: (1) waive document fraud as a ground of inadmissibility; and (2) address determinations with respect to children. In the wake of last week's earthquake, I am happy to see that the Obama Administration decided to extend temporary protection status to Haitians facing deportation.

Once again, I am devastated by the immeasurable tragedy that occurred in Haiti. Along with my colleagues, I hope to visit Haiti in the near future to meet with their leaders and see what the United States can do to rebuild the shattered livelihoods.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the Chair of the State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 1021, with appreciation for the leadership of BARBARA LEE, a member of my committee; DONALD PAYNE; and sincere condolences for the victims of last Tuesday's tragic earthquake and continuing aftershocks. Yet another

natural disaster has devastated this country and its people. My deep sympathy and prayers are with the people of Haiti and all those who have lost loved ones.

As the resolution notes, the U.S. Government and the American people stand in solidarity with the Haitian people and are committed to helping them in this great time of need. The intense challenges of delivering humanitarian relief are compounded in Haiti by weak infrastructure and government institutions that cannot provide the necessary support for relief.

I commend the swift response by the Obama administration, especially USAID, the State Department, HHS, the Department of Defense, as well as the international community, to quickly mobilize humanitarian and disaster relief in a complex humanitarian disaster.

I also want to acknowledge the outstanding work of many, many other countries; and I want to particularly commend Israel for its immediate response with search and rescue teams, fully equipped hospitals and doctors, Doctors Without Borders, and thousands of NGOs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. LEE of California. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. LOWEY. Lastly, in addition to the thousands of NGOs, I want to commend a group started by Danielle Butin in my district that has been collecting medical supplies and shipping containers daily with the help of many, many volunteers. This is a job for all of us, and I am very, very pleased that there are so many governments and individuals who are working to relieve this terrible, terrible effect of the disaster.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, before I recognize my next speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1021, expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake of January 12, 2010.

Madam Speaker, Americans are deeply saddened by the tremendous damage and loss of life caused by the earthquake that struck Haiti on January 12th.

The earthquake was truly a devastating natural disaster. There are enormous needs in Haiti. Authorities say that the earthquake may have killed 200,000 people. Three million people in Haiti need food, water, shelter, and medical assistance, according to an estimate given by the United Nations.

Tens of thousands of people sleep in the streets or under plastic sheets in makeshift

camp. The spread of disease has become a major concern in Haiti. Tens of thousands of children have been orphaned by the earthquake.

I join with my colleagues in expressing the sympathies of the Congress, recognizing the long-term need for American assistance, and urging the President to adopt multiple approaches to assisting those affected by this tragedy now and in the future.

It is important to have the federal government participate in the broad, international relief effort. Action by the federal government demonstrates leadership from the highest level of government in helping meet the deep need for humanitarian aid.

Booker T. Washington captured well the importance of assisting people in need when he said, "The highest test of the civilization of any race is in its willingness to extend a helping hand to the less fortunate."

I am very proud that the American response to the Haitian tragedy is not limited to our government. Individuals, businesses, and philanthropic organizations have joined with our global colleague to respond to this tragedy.

During this time of extreme difficulty in Haiti, charities have raised more than \$210 million in donations for Haiti earthquake relief. A campaign using text messages brought in over \$21 million for the Red Cross for relief efforts.

In Chicago, I know that many churches, especially the Church of God in Christ, are rising to meet the tremendous needs of the people affected by the Haitian tragedy. The international community has come together to assist Haiti by sending emergency funds, search and rescue teams, food and water, and medical teams.

I want to emphasize that this resolution recognizes that Haiti's needs will be great, both in the short-term and the long-term. I believe that Americans and our government will rise to help meet these immediate and future challenges.

The people of Haiti and the United States have a long and complex relationship dating back to pre-slavery days. Our cultures, and our respective economic histories and destinies, are deeply intertwined. It is natural and just for our nation to take the lead in extending a hand of immediate relief to the people of Haiti in the aftermath of this horrific disaster and ultimately a hand in rebuilding their shattered nation so that the Haitian people can join with the developed nations of the world in a 21st century standard of living and security.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a member of the Committee on Natural Resources, who is the second vice Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

□ 1545

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, in this time of sadness and tragedy for the people of Haiti and all of us who are their friends, I rise in support of Resolution 1021, expressing our condolences and solidarity with the people of Haiti and their families throughout the diaspora, and the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands join me on these sentiments.

On Martin Luther King Day, I joined some of our clergy in leading a prayer

vigil for the people of Haiti, and I am proud to report on the funding that has been sent in, to report that the Haiti community support and teams of doctors and nurses from my district began a rotation of medical supplies immediately following the quake.

On Monday, a ship normally stationed at HOVENSA, the oil refinery on St. Croix, was commissioned to Port-au-Prince, and left, carrying supplies from several organizations including Rotary, Hispanos Unidos, and a group led by Haitian American Virgin Islander Andre McBean. We thank them and the Haitian American organization in St. Thomas led by Oskar Lalanne, Hans Oriol, and Gerard Bateau, who have also sent supplies and provided aid on the ground, including the assembling of creole speaking interpreters who are so needed during this disaster.

Today, with this resolution we signal the commitment of this Congress and the people of the United States to standing with Haiti—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. LEE of California. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Not just now, during the immediate response, but for what will be a long and difficult recovery.

I thank our chairwoman, BARBARA LEE, for introducing the resolution and all of the Congressional Black Caucus and others for their leadership in support of Haiti, both before and since January 12.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding and also for her strong support and her assistance with this resolution.

Let me now yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, a member of the Committee on Small Business, who also serves as an officer of the whip of the Congressional Black Caucus, hails from the Caribbean, a leader on so many issues, Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus and member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for bringing us together, along with the ranking member, for this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my heartfelt condolences and in support of the Haitian people, the Haitian American community in the United States and the Caribbean island nation of Haiti, and ask my colleagues to support Resolution 1021.

As the representative of the second largest Haitian American population in the United States, this crisis has truly and literally hit home. My office has been inundated and overwhelmed with



constituents calling, earnestly trying to find their loved ones. Many of them are hoping family members are still alive and safe, despite the many images of destruction they see in the media.

The situation on the ground remains unstable. Lives still hang in the balance, and a speedy and coordinated action is needed to maximize the recovery effort and to mitigate the loss of life.

With this resolution, we are sending a unified message to the Haitian people that we stand with them as they mourn the loss of their loved ones and prepare to rebuild their nation. This resolution lets the whole world know that Haiti is as much a part of us as we are a part of them.

Over the last week, the American people have been pouring out their hearts to the nation. I would like to commend our people, the U.S. military, Coast Guard, search and rescue teams, humanitarian NGOs, for all of their work. I would like to recognize the swift response from the Obama administration in providing immediate investment and thank them.

Ms. LEE of California. I now yield 2 minutes to the Chair of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, a leader on so many issues who has been involved with Haiti since I have known her, and that has been since the 1970s, who has led the charge for debt relief, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS.

Ms. WATERS. I would like to thank my good friend, the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus and a friend of Haiti's who has been working on behalf of Haiti for many years, BARBARA LEE.

I rise to support this resolution, which expresses the condolences of the House of Representatives with the people of Haiti following last week's devastating earthquake. I especially appreciate the fact that this resolution urges multilateral financial institutions to immediately suspend further debt payment from Haiti and to develop processes to cancel all of Haiti's remaining debt.

Haiti cannot begin to recover from the earthquake while continuing to make payments on debts owed to multilateral financial institutions like the IMF, the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank. Even before the earthquake occurred, debt payments were a tremendous burden that interfered with the ability of Haiti's Government to meet the needs of its people.

Haiti worked very hard over the past several years to qualify for debt relief. In order to qualify, the Government of Haiti successfully developed and implemented a comprehensive Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper under the direction of the IMF and the World Bank. As a result, multilateral financial institutions provided Haiti \$1.2 billion in debt relief last June. Nevertheless, Haiti still owes a total of \$664 million in debt to multilateral financial institutions.

The IMF offered Haiti a new \$100 million loan for earthquake recovery efforts. Unfortunately, new loans that will add to Haiti's debt burden are not what Haiti needs at this critical time. I was encouraged to learn that IMF managing director, Dominique Strauss-Kahn, expressed support for canceling all of Haiti's debt, including the new loan, and I look forward to working with him to do so.

On behalf of the Black Caucus, I am introducing legislation to require the United States Secretary of the Treasury to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States within the multilateral financial institutions to cancel all of Haiti's remaining debt, and I hope all of my colleagues will support it. Canceling Haiti's debts will free up the country's meager resources, allowing it to begin meeting its immediate and long-term needs.

Again, I would like to thank my good friend and leader, BARBARA LEE, for introducing this legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE, a member of our House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding.

When this situation occurred in Haiti, when the earthquake came through and devastated the land, the buildings, and the lives of the people, there were over 30,000 Americans in Haiti at the time. Many of these Americans were there as volunteers to help this struggling nation. They were from churches throughout the United States. They were young people, civic organizations already there helping this struggling nation.

One group particularly, from my hometown of Houston, a group of Rotarians, had just gotten there to work in two places. They were going to work in the hospitals, to make the hospitals better and more convenient and more efficient, and they were also there to dig water wells for the Haitian people. And all of these people that were there from America, most of them, were volunteers.

It has been said that government can never replace a volunteer, and that is true. Americans are the most giving people on Earth, and they were helping Haiti. And I suspect Americans will go and help Haiti again, to volunteer, all of these civic religious organizations. And that is a good thing, because that is what we do in America. We help other people. We help our own people, and we help foreign nations and their people as well, because America in the time of crisis responds.

So I commend the Americans that are working, along with the NGOs and the officials of our government and other governments, in this struggling time to help the people of Haiti get their lives back together so that they can once again be a productive nation in the community of countries.

Ms. LEE of California. I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague and friend from California (Mr. SCHIFF), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I join my colleague from California (Ms. LEE) in expressing my profound sorrow at the tragedy that has been visited upon the people of Haiti.

Even now, a week after the earthquake that shattered Port-au-Prince and much of the surrounding area, rescuers are still pulling survivors from the rubble, including a 15-day-old baby girl who was pulled from her home, destroyed, yesterday, after 7 days without food and water. Happily, the baby has been reunited with her mother, who told the Wall Street Journal that her daughter's survival was "the mercy of God." Hours later, 69-year-old Anna Zizi was dragged singing from the rubble of the Roman Catholic cathedral of Port-au-Prince, while Hotteline Lozama, age 25, was pulled from the ruins of a shopping center.

But, despite these miracles, the horror is overwhelming. Current estimates place the death toll at 200,000, and more than 1.5 million Haitians have been made homeless as a result of the earthquake. Major aftershocks, including a magnitude 6.1 tremor this morning, have hampered rescue efforts and kept survivors in a state of near panic.

The extent of the damage and totality of the need have overwhelmed the massive international aid effort that is racing to get food and water to more than 3 million people. Even as U.N. reinforcements and additional U.S. military and civilian assets scramble to the stricken island, an estimated 20,000 people a day are dying, most from lack of adequate medical care.

There is an unfortunate familiarity to the images that have been broadcast around the world in the aftermath of this tragedy: the pleading eyes, the fear, and the sorrow mixed with stoicism. We have seen them before in New Orleans after Katrina, in Southeast Asia after the tsunami, in Pakistan after the earthquake there, and the aftermath of countless other disasters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. LEE of California. I yield the gentleman 20 additional seconds.

Mr. SCHIFF. But even though the scenes are familiar and unsettling, we cannot turn away and we must not shirk our obligation to aid our neighbor in her hour of need. I urge the President to continue to press for faster deployment of aid and reconstruction personnel.

I thank my colleague for her leadership and her support of the resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from California (Ms. LEE) for the bipartisan approach to this terrible, terrible situation.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Before I close, I yield 1½ minutes to my friend from New Jersey, Chair of the African Global Health Subcommittee, Chairman PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me, once again, express our deep appreciation for the outcry of Members of this legislative body on both sides of the aisle.

We have heard of the great work done by many of the countries mentioned. We have heard about the heroism and the heroic efforts of many of the people. We have seen isolated shots of some violence and disorder, but let me say that this is just a very small sliver of what is happening in Haiti. Most of the people are waiting patiently. Most of the people are orderly.

It is amazing, the resilience of the Haitian people from these overwhelming obstacles, that 99 percent of the people are just trying to make it through. So we need to engage with the government. We need to assist them as they start to recover politically and governmentally.

In addition to restoring the city, we need to take a look at perhaps a new city outside of Port-au-Prince, a city built for 50,000 people that has 2 million people. Can you imagine that? So this may be a way that we can have a planned approach. We have great colleges. Columbia University has the Earth Institute, and we would hope to try to encourage those groups to come in.

With that, let me commend our chairperson once again.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, let me thank all of the Members today for coming down to the floor in support of this resolution but, more importantly, in support of the people of Haiti.

I end by calling on all my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure to express our deepest condolences, our steadfast solidarity, and our sustained commitment to the people of Haiti in the wake of this ongoing tragedy.

□ 1600

As we move forward, let us not waiver in saying to the people of Haiti: Your resilience, your dignity, your courage, even during your darkest hour, continues to inspire us. And during your darkest hour, the United States, and the American people, will not abandon you as you continue to struggle for a brighter tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the struggles of the Haitian people in the aftermath of the disastrous earthquake that hit the island nation on January 12, 2010. The images of the aftermath of the earthquake are startling and sobering reminders of the power of nature and of our obligation as human beings to assist those who are less fortunate.

In the short term, Haiti's emergency needs are overwhelming. Even with the death and casualty toll estimates still coming in, we know that there is an urgent need for food, medi-

cines, water, emergency shelter, and equipment. The immediate response from our citizens has been gratifying. Within 24 hours following the quake, we saw Americans from a cross section of society—from elected officials in Washington to everyday residents all over New York City—reach out and offer assistance.

The Obama Administration, for its part, has pledged its full support for rescue and humanitarian assistance. I applaud President Obama's decision to pledge \$100 million in relief aid. It is clear that there will be an even greater need for a long-term commitment to rebuild the nation's infrastructure, and to provide educational, security, and economic assistance. As the leader in our hemisphere and Haiti's most important political partner, the United States should lead the way in supporting these efforts.

There will come a time when the people of Haiti are no longer headlines in the media; and yet they will still be in desperate need of help from the international community. It is at this time that we must pull together and unite to help the citizens of Haiti rebuild their country. Similar to a national public works program, the building and repairing of roads and bridges, schools, hospitals and health care clinics, and the undertaking of massive reforestation should create much needed jobs for Haitians.

I would also like to thank President Obama and Secretary Napolitano for granting the thousands of Haitian nationals in America with Temporary Protective Status. This humanitarian gesture will allow our Haitian brothers and sisters, neighbors and friends, many of whom have been among us for several years, to remain here, work hard, and contribute to the efforts of rebuilding their homeland while in America.

Haiti has been a long-time friend and ally of the United States, and now it is our turn to exercise our friendship in their time of need.

Madam Speaker, I invite you and my colleagues in joining me to dedicate our efforts, and commit ourselves to supporting, the long-suffering Haitian people, now and into the future.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues and extend my deepest sympathies to the people of Haiti, and to their worried and grieving loved ones around the world, after the tragic earthquake that devastated so much of the nation last Tuesday. It is heartbreaking that a country that has suffered through so much in its history now must endure this unimaginable disaster. My thoughts and prayers also go out to the injured and missing Americans, Haitian-Americans with families impacted by this tragedy, and families and colleagues of the United Nations personnel who lost their lives.

I would also like to applaud President Obama's quick action in sending civilian and military personnel and humanitarian resources to help in rescue and recovery, and am ready to work with my colleagues in Congress to support the Administration's efforts. I call on all Americans to continue to show their support for the people of Haiti, whether by contributing to the Red Cross or other charitable organizations operating in Haiti, or offering products or services that may be needed.

In times of terrible suffering, the world community comes together to help those in need, and that is what we have seen in the after-

math of the Haiti earthquake. Now, we must ensure that our attention and our efforts do not waver. I thank Congresswoman LEE for her leadership in bringing this resolution to the Floor and urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1021, a resolution expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake there.

My sincerest condolences and prayers are with the citizens of Haiti, their friends and families on Long Island and throughout the United States as well as the many American citizens who live and work in Haiti.

In times of tragedy, it is essential that we come to the aid of our neighbors. have been proud of the response by U.S. Federal, State, and local agencies that have been centrally involved with providing emergency response to Haiti. Local law enforcement and first responders throughout Long Island and New York have pledged to lend their expertise to the relief efforts. After the initial emergency has passed, it is important that we stay committed to helping Haiti onto the path towards a full recovery.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to comprehend the depth of tragedy and sorrow that has visited the poor island of Haiti. It is difficult to convey the depth of our sympathy and shock at the catastrophe that has befallen the Haitian people.

Madam Speaker, the extent of the misery, destruction and death is nearly beyond imagination. It surely puts our own national trials and tribulations into perspective.

I am encouraged by the expression of solidarity that has sprung up across the United States. I hope that expression manifests not merely in words but in real action, real contributions, financial and otherwise, to aid our suffering Haitian brothers and sisters.

I encourage the Obama Administration to continue working closely with the United Nations and the international community to ensure that the provision of critical assistance to the most vulnerable, the grievously injured and homeless, is the top priority of aid efforts.

I encourage the American people to look with understanding and not with scorn upon the chaos that inevitably accompanies such disasters, wherever they occur.

And I pledge, on behalf of my constituents, the full power and influence of Georgia's Fourth Congressional District to the effort to relieve Haitian suffering and save Haitian lives as the toll of this disaster continues to rise.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of passing both H. Res. 1021 and H.R. 4462. During this time of terrible tragedy in Haiti, it is imperative that we stand with the Haitian people as they work to rescue, recover and eventually rebuild.

Haiti is the poorest, and perhaps most struggling of our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. Although there has been much progress with the development of a democratic parliamentary system, there is still a long way to go and this natural disaster is undoubtedly a terrible setback to Haiti's development. Sadly, many casualties of this tragedy have been humanitarian workers and peacekeepers whose work was far from completed. With that in mind, it is imperative that we keep their mission alive by supporting greater resources for further aid workers and peacekeeping forces.

Since the day the earthquake occurred, I have been touched by the outpouring of support from Americans and am pleased that Congress is able to act so swiftly to pass legislation that speeds up the tax deduction for charitable contributions for Haiti. It is yet another way for us to help those who want to help the people of Haiti through this time of tragedy.

I urge my colleagues to pass both H. Res. 1021 and H.R. 4462 and to keep the people of Haiti in our thoughts and prayers.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues to express my profound condolences to the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating 7.0-magnitude earthquake that struck the nation on January 12, 2010.

I led a congressional delegation to Haiti in May 2009 to support that country's efforts to promote democracy, stability and prosperity. During that visit, I saw the many challenges Haitians face and how they meet those challenges with courage and determination.

Our delegation met with Haitian President Rene Preval at the National Palace and we also met with members of the Haitian Parliament at the Senate building. To now see photos of both of those buildings in ruins and to hear stories of members of the Senate being pulled out of the rubble has strengthened my resolve to continue to support Haiti and its people. The tragic images and on-the-ground news reports cannot but move us to action.

We also visited two Partners in Health, PIH, facilities. PIH brings modern medical care to poor communities around the world and has been working in Haiti for over 20 years. Thankfully, PIH facilities in the central plateau region of Haiti, while experiencing the strong shock of the earthquake, had no major building damage or staff or patient injuries. PIH was able to mobilize their resources and bring medical assistance and supplies to other areas of the island that have been hardest hit. None of this has been easy to do in a country where the infrastructure, subpar to begin with, was virtually destroyed. I thank PIH as well as all the other organizations and individuals for the difficult work they are doing in Haiti in the wake of this devastation.

President Barack Obama acted very quickly and decisively to send vital assistance to Haiti. The Administration's coordination of this international relief effort has been one of the largest in recent history.

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has said that our efforts to rebuild Haiti will be a long term investment and I stand by her commitment. Our country has a special responsibility to help our neighbor move beyond the poverty, despair, and dysfunction that have plagued Haiti for far too long.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of continued investment in the people of Haiti.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, I rise in solidarity with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus in support of the people of Haiti.

Last weekend, in my district, I held a city-wide interfaith prayer service where we sought God's grace and mercy for the lives of those who were lost in last week's earthquake as well as for the survivors, the rescue workers and those who, miraculously, continue to be pulled alive from the rubble.

I strongly support the swift action, last week, by the Obama Administration to grant tem-

porary protected status for Haitian immigrants already living in this country. I urge the Administration to continue to bring the full weight and resources of the federal government in support of a nation whose history intersects with that of the founding of the United States.

Haiti is a nation to whom our nation owes an enormous debt of gratitude. It was the brave people of Haiti who tirelessly fought French aggressors, in the early 1800s, thereby preventing that nation from advancing to the shores of America in the early years after the founding of our republic.

My commitment to Haiti is to do all I can do, in our nation's capitol and at home in Chicago, to help restore, rebuild and strengthen Haiti. My hope and prayer is that it will emerge stronger than it was before last week's tragic turn of events.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I want to join with the American people in paying tribute to the Haitian people. Who have suffered so much. But who have proven so strong. While the world does all it can to help, it is the Haitian people, first and foremost, who are saving themselves.

I also want to honor those who have rushed to Haiti's aid from across the globe: the diplomats and aid workers, the humanitarians, the volunteers, and the members of the military—particularly the United States Coast Guard.

Last but certainly not least, I want to pay tribute to the men and women of the United Nations peacekeeping mission known as MINUSTAH. They came to a foreign land. To help give a foreign people a better life. Now many of them are dead. Or injured. Or missing.

We must ensure that their sacrifice was not in vain. We must work with the Haitian people and the world to help Haiti recover. Because doing so is not just in line with our interests. It is in keeping with our most basic and cherished values of compassion and common decency.

Ms. LEE of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1021.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### CONDEMNING VIOLENT SUPPRESSION IN GUINEA

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1013) condemning the violent suppression of legitimate political dissent and gross human rights abuses in the Republic of Guinea, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1013

Whereas, on December 23, 2008, a military junta calling itself the National Council for Democracy and Development (CNDD) seized power in the Republic of Guinea hours after the death of longtime President Lansana Conté, suspended the national legislature and the constitution, and committed to hold free and fair national elections as part of a "peaceful transition" to a civilian-led government;

Whereas delays in electoral preparations and statements by CNDD leader Captain Moussa Dadis Camara that he might run for president, in contravention of earlier commitments that neither he nor any other member of the CNDD would run as a candidate in the elections, provoked increasing public discontent with the junta;

Whereas, on September 28, 2009, tens of thousands of unarmed civilians gathered at the national soccer stadium in Conakry to protest against the CNDD;

Whereas security forces responded by surrounding the stadium and opening fire with live ammunition on the crowd, reportedly killing over 150 people and injuring over 1,000;

Whereas prominent opposition leaders were then beaten and arrested by soldiers; demonstrators and opposition party members were detained without charge; and at least 60 women were brutally raped, sexually molested, or killed by security forces, many of them in public and in full sight of their commanders;

Whereas an investigation by Human Rights Watch indicates that "the [stadium] massacre and widespread rape were organized and premeditated" and that armed forces had attempted to "hide evidence of the crimes by seizing bodies from the stadium and the city's morgues and burying them in mass graves";

Whereas the security forces responsible for the violence on September 28, 2009, reportedly included troops from the Presidential Guard and gendarmes working with the State Secretariat for Special Services, both of which answer directly to the presidency;

Whereas, on October 30, 2009, the United Nations Secretary-General announced the appointment of an international commission of inquiry to probe the violence of September 28, 2009;

Whereas the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) has appointed President Blaise Compaoré of Burkina Faso to mediate between the CNDD, opposition parties, and civil society in an effort to break the current political impasse;

Whereas the African Union, ECOWAS, the European Union, and the United States have imposed targeted sanctions, variously including travel restrictions, financial asset freezes, and an arms embargo, on CNDD members in response to the violent crackdown and perceived CNDD resistance to a democratic transition;

Whereas while others were imposing sanctions against the CNDD, it was announced in October that the China International Fund, a Hong Kong-registered company with ties to Chinese state-owned enterprises and government agencies, has signed a \$7 billion deal with the CNDD to develop Guinea's vast mineral resources;

Whereas the CNDD reportedly has imported millions of dollars worth of weapons since the September 28, 2009, crackdown and junta members reportedly are recruiting militias, adding a troubling and potentially explosive ethnic dimension to the crisis;

Whereas targeted political killings reportedly have been carried out in Conakry since September 2009, opposition members continue to face the threat of arrest and violent assault, and the junta has banned all public protests;

Whereas, on December 3, 2009, Captain Moussa Dadis Camara was shot in the head in an apparent assassination attempt by his aide-de-camp Lt. Aboubakar Diakite (Toumba) and flown to Morocco for treatment, prompting analysts to warn of a potential counter coup and a further deterioration of security in Guinea;

Whereas a further deterioration of the political and security situation in Guinea could have catastrophic consequences not only for Guinea, but also for neighboring Liberia and Sierra Leone, both of which only recently emerged from deadly, protracted conflicts;

Whereas Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has referred to the September 28, 2009, crackdown as "criminality of the greatest degree", and stated that Guinea's military leaders must recognize "that they cannot remain in power, that they must turn back to the people the right to choose their own leaders";

Whereas, on January 6, 2010, interim junta leader General Sekouba Konate invited the opposition in Guinea to select a prime minister in advance of the formation of a transitional government and offered security guarantees to opposition leaders who had fled the country; and

Whereas, on January 15, 2010, the "Declaration Conjointe de Ouagadougou" to end the political crisis in Guinea, mediated by Burkina Faso's President Blaise Compaoré, was signed by opposition parties and junta leaders, and supported by the International Contact Group on Guinea, provides for the establishment of a government of national unity, led by a consensus Prime Minister, and the holding of presidential elections within six months in order to reestablish the rule of law and bring peace and stability to the people of Guinea: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the violent suppression of legitimate political dissent and gross human rights abuses, including mass murder and extreme sexual violence, perpetrated by forces under the command of the National Council for Democracy and Development (CNDD) in Guinea and demands that the perpetrators of these crimes be brought to justice;

(2) expresses grave concern about the further deterioration of security and rule of law in Guinea, particularly with regard to ongoing reports of—

(A) harassment of opposition figures, members of civil society, and journalists;

(B) rising ethnic tensions;

(C) growing cleavages within the CNDD and the military which raise the potential of a violent counter coup;

(D) recruitment of militias and other irregular forces from within Guinea and neighboring countries;

(E) importation of weapons despite an arms embargo on the region; and

(F) uncertainty about the prospects for restoring civilian rule through free, fair, and transparent elections;

(3) calls on China to cease its material support for the CNDD by publicly announcing the cancellation of the China International Fund's \$7 billion minerals and infrastructure deal in Guinea;

(4) urges all Member States of the United Nations to join the United States, the European Union (EU), the African Union (AU), and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) to impose sanctions against the regime until constitutional order and rule of law has been restored in Guinea;

(5) supports the efforts of the ECOWAS and the AU to find a resolution to the current political crisis in Guinea;

(6) urges the leaders of the CNDD, the Force Vives Coalition, and all parties in Guinea to uphold and abide by the provisions included in the "Declaration Conjointe de Ouagadougou" and to facilitate the conduct of free, fair, and transparent elections that meet international standards and reflect the will of the Guinean people; and

(7) expresses solidarity with the people of Guinea during this time of extreme uncertainty and expresses deep regret for the victims of the September 28, 2009, crackdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the Chair of the Africa and Global Health Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to begin by thanking the ranking member, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for introducing this important and timely resolution. In December 2008, after the death of President Lansana Conte, a military junta seized power in the West African country of Guinea and suspended the national legislature and the constitution. The coup interrupted plans for upcoming democratic elections and threatened the fragile stability of the entire West African Mano River region, where decade-long wars in Liberia and Sierra Leone have displaced thousands of families, destroying the capacity of their governments to function. Fortunately, the Economic Community of West African States, the African Union, and the United Nations acted immediately to rebuke the coup, demand an immediate end to the violence, and a restoration of the rule of law.

After the horrific killing of 57 peaceful protesters in October, 2009, the U.S. Government, along with the African Union, imposed travel and financial sanctions against the junta. The swift and concerted action by the entire international community, including the United Nations, the European

Union, and individual states, clearly caught the attention of the coup leader, Captain Moussa Dadis Camara and his junta. Unlike many previous African coups that were allowed to seize governmental control and consolidate military dictatorships, the Guinea coup was isolated by African States. And this is a move that—the Africa Union has decided that, in order to end military coups, they must treat rogue states with isolation.

This past weekend, Guinea's junta leaders agreed to relinquish power to civilian rule, establish an interim government, and support the restoration of the constitution. The military leaders also agreed to appoint as prime minister the opposition leader, Jean-Marie Dore, and to prepare for new presidential elections in 6 months.

Madam Speaker, we should commend the people of Guinea for standing fast in the face of military violence and demanding a return to the rule of law, and congratulate the international community for uniting so quickly in order to restore order in Guinea.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. First, I want to thank the ranking member, the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for introducing this resolution, and I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1013, which condemns the violent suppression of legitimate political dissent and gross human rights abuses in the Republic of Guinea.

Analysts have been warning that Guinea, an impoverished yet resource-rich country in West Africa, has been teetering on the brink of chaos for years. Throughout the 1990s, Guinea was flanked by brutal civil wars in neighboring countries. This aggravated existing ethnic tensions within Guinea and left the entire subregion awash with small arms and mercenaries for hire.

Demonstrations throughout the years 2006 and 2007 were brutally put down by military security forces, leaving hundreds dead and thousands injured. The ailing longtime president was so corrupt and unpopular that the citizens of Guinea reportedly readily embraced the military junta to replace him when he finally died in December of 2008. Unfortunately, the junta would not usher in peace. Despite initial positive signals, repeated delays in the elections and the timetable provoked increasing public discontent.

On September 28, 2009, tens of thousands of unarmed civilians gathered at the national soccer stadium to protest against the junta. Security forces responded by surrounding the stadium, blocking the exits, and opening fire with live ammunition on the crowds. In the chaos that ensued, over 150 people were killed; more than 1,000 people were injured; at least 60 women were brutally raped, sexually assaulted, or

killed by security officials in plain sight of commanding officers; and prominent opposition leaders were beaten and arrested while demonstrators and opposing party members were detained without any formal charge.

Almost immediately, the United States, the European Union, and the Economic Community of West African States imposed targeted sanctions against the junta and called for the return of a civilian government. The junta then reportedly starting importing millions of dollars of weapons and recruiting ethnic militias. This prompted analysts to warn that Guinea had become a tinderbox that could blow at any time, potentially taking neighboring Liberia and Sierra Leone with it.

On December 3, 2009, junta leader Dadis was shot in the head by an aide and was flown to Morocco, where he remained for nearly 6 weeks. In his absence, the acting junta leader announced that a transitional government would be formed and that the opposition had been invited to select a prime minister. Despite a political agreement between the junta and the opposition being signed this past weekend, the situation in Guinea remains extremely fragile. Details about the formation of a transitional government and eventual return to civilian rule remain unclear. The mere suggestion that Dadis would return to Guinea last week prompted the acting junta leader to threaten his resignation. The junta leadership and the military remain deeply divided. Ethnic militias remain well-armed.

The deterioration of security in Guinea threatens to undermine our massive investment in peace in Liberia, Sierra Leone, and the Ivory Coast. More importantly, a collapse of Guinea would create yet another pocket of opportunity for extremists and narcotraffickers who already exploit West Africa's weak institutions and vast ungoverned areas. To begin to address these issues, the ranking member, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN from Florida, has introduced H. Res. 1013. And this is what it does: It expresses grave concern over the deterioration of security and the rule of law in Guinea. It calls on China to cancel its \$7 billion in minerals and infrastructure deal with Guinea. It urges member states of the United Nations to join the United States, the African Union, the Economic Community of West African States, and the European Union, in imposing sanctions against the ruling junta in Guinea until constitutional order is restored. It supports regional efforts to resolve the conflict. It calls on members of the ruling junta to uphold their pledges to organize free and fair and transparent elections to restore civilian rule in Guinea. And it expresses solidarity with the people of Guinea during this time of extreme uncertainty in their lives.

I want to thank the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr.

BERMAN, for supporting this measure and enabling it to come to the floor today. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan, uncontroversial, and timely resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARAMENDI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1013, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1615

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### TEAR DOWN THESE WALLS OF SECRECY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the deep, dark dungeons of this Capitol, the government trolls are writing bills behind closed doors. Their aim has always been to take away our liberty one step at a time. It's what bureaucrats do. They look for ways to grow and take over more of our lives to justify their existence. So these elite government trolls think they know better how to run our lives than we do, and they keep their bills in secret so we, the people, won't know what's in them until it's too late, until the legislation is forced upon an unwilling, misinformed people.

It has been decades since freedom and liberty faced a full frontal assault from a single piece of legislation, a bill that is so damaging in scope that by its passage, American freedom and American health will be sacrificed on the altar of more government control. Of course I'm talking about the universal government takeover of health care. This is the most important piece of legislation in modern history, and we were promised—we were promised that we in this House, we would have transparency. We would see what is taking place.

The administration promised us that transparency. In fact, the administration invited interested parties in health care to the White House to discuss health care. Of course, for some reason I wasn't on that invitation list because I'm always willing to discuss

my position and the position of the people I represent. We were promised that cameras would film the transparency, cameras like C-SPAN, cameras like the ones here in the House of Representatives, down the hallway in the U.S. Senate so the American people can see what takes place. I believe in cameras so that the American public can see what happens in our Republic.

When I was a judge back in Texas, I was one of the first judges to allow cameras into the courtroom so the American people could see what took place in a criminal trial. I've offered legislation to have cameras in the United States Supreme Court, in their hearings, so the most important, most powerful Court in the United States and in the world, the people can see what takes place over there. Of course, that legislation hasn't gone anywhere.

And C-SPAN, what do they do? Well, they're not a news organization in the sense that they have commentators. They just film what takes place, and the American public decides. C-SPAN wants to film what is taking place somewhere in the dungeons of this Capitol where the trolls are writing yet another health care bill.

You know, Mr. Speaker, health care is more than about just government control of health care. It's about government control of our lives. It's more about government raising taxes, more government spending, more borrowing from the Chinese and from the Japanese and more oppression. A government takeover of health care is unhealthy, and it's not going to make the American health better. It's going to make the individual health of the American people actually worse, given that the government control over health and health care is not compatible with liberty.

Mr. Speaker, if we love the competence of FEMA and the efficiency of the post office and the compassion of the IRS, we're going to love nationalized health care. Allowing our rulers to construct these bills in secret is exactly how they will bring about these liberty-killing laws.

Patrick Henry, one of my heroes, said, "The liberties of a people never were, nor ever will be secure when the transactions of their rulers may be concealed from them. Let me repeat that: 'The liberties of a people never were, nor ever will be secure when the transactions of their rulers may be concealed from them.'" And that's exactly what's taking place in this third health care bill that is supposedly being written by Members of the Senate and Members of the House somewhere in this Capitol.

When rulers plot against the people in secret, it makes it hard for the people to fight back because they really don't know what's going on. But, Mr. Speaker, the people are fighting back. They are fighting back with ballots and not bullets. That was proven yesterday in Massachusetts. The way things are running in Washington,

D.C., these days, the proof is purposely hidden from the people. And the question is why. Why can't the people see through C-SPAN what is taking place behind closed doors? Because it's giving power to government and not to the people. And that's why we're not being allowed to see what's taking place.

It's about changing the phrase "We the People" to "We the Subjects." And that's why We, the People, aren't allowed to see what's taking place behind these closed doors in secret. So much for transparency. Spending, taxing, regulating and borrowing, that's what's taking place. There is nothing more these days that the taxocrats won't try to tax or regulate.

Ronald Reagan once said, "Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream . . . It must be fought for, protected and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was like once in the United States where men were free."

Legislation, Mr. Speaker, especially the most important in recent years, health care, should be done openly, openly so we can see what's taking place. So I say, open up the steel gates, quit hiding the facts from the citizens. Mr. President, open the gates of transparency and openness. And, Mr. President, tear down these walls of secrecy.

And that's just the way it is.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

#### WALL STREET POLICE LINEUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the first hearing of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission was held last week, and the four biggest bank chief executive officers were brought in for questioning, from Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America and Morgan Stanley. The American people expect these men to be held accountable for what their banks did to our country. They came away with no sweat on their brow.

The bankers in the photo are, from left to right, Lloyd C. Blankfein of Goldman Sachs who says he's been doing God's work. He has been showering himself just since 2006 with \$157.3 million in compensation. I often ask myself, What do they do with all that money? Jamie Dimon, next to him, of JPMorgan Chase last year officially took home \$19.7 million on top of \$95.7 million he raked in from 2005 to 2007. That brings him in at \$115.4 million. John J. Mack of Morgan Stanley paid

himself \$78.9 million over the last 5 years, and Brian T. Moynihan of Bank of America is new to his position at that bank, but he pocketed \$10 million in 2007 when serving as president of the Global Corporate and Investment Banking at the Bank of America. Can you imagine what he'll make now?

As they took America to the cleaners, the average worker in our country hasn't had a real wage increase in over a decade, much less a real increase in buying power. Meanwhile, Americans are being made to feel like they can't enter this debate because lots of fog is being generated by fancy terms that these bankers use, like basis points or collateralized debt obligations or securitization. And I'll tell you what, Americans might not know what those words mean, but they can recognize a lineup when they see one.

The average person often is cowered by the world of finance and turns away in fear and confusion. They can't see a path forward for our country, which they love so very much. And they are very worried. Congress must provide the clarity of that path forward to not only hold these bankers accountable but to get the administration to act to save people's homes and communities. The administration's current plan to fix the foreclosure crisis has been a dud. It is a dud because it has not addressed the root cause of the collapse. It continues. The wrongdoers, they aren't good at risk at all, but they're putting economic recovery at risk across this Nation as more people fall into foreclosure.

According to an analysis done by the Associated Press, almost a year later, only a handful, a fraction, of the 4 million Americans and counting, who have been foreclosed, have been able to complete Treasury's application process to try to rework their mortgage. Some might call that approach "doomed to fail."

With a national unemployment rate of over 10 percent, people are not getting the economic change they want. The current approach to the economy here in Washington is failing millions and millions of our citizens every day. People's financial futures are ruined. Their futures aren't ruined; they're getting rewarded. Our people are getting hurt by unemployment, home foreclosures and personal bankruptcies. They're not going bankrupt. Their banks didn't go bankrupt. We bailed them out. I didn't vote for that, but a majority of people in here did.

RealtyTrac Inc. reported last week that in 2009 a record 2.8 million households were threatened with foreclosure, which is up, not down, more than 20 percent since 2008. The more borrowers who can't be helped, the more foreclosed properties will be on the market across this country. Tragically, RealtyTrac expects another record number of homes to be threatened with foreclosure this year. This is not acceptable in America.

The administration's foreclosure prevention plan says it's going to help

borrowers in financial trouble by making their payments more affordable and extending the repayment period. However, out of the millions and millions of people being affected across this country, just 7 percent of those who have signed up have completed the Treasury Department's program to try to rework these loans; and more than 49,000, or just 5 percent, have dropped out of the program entirely. Thousands more remain in limbo. But the biggest bank in the program, Bank of America, has completed modifications for fewer than 2 percent of the 200,000 borrowers they claim to enroll. Its big-bank buddies are in the same boat when it comes to modifying our people's mortgages. The people paying their bills and paying for their salaries aren't having their mortgages reworked. What's just about that?

In fact, it's clear, Wall Street bankers have no interest in modifying mortgages. They are making millions off other people's misery, and that's just fine with them. This Nation needs a national foreclosure prevention program that compels these bankers to act, not nicely request their assistance. As they conspire to avoid the consequences of their actions, here are two key findings by the Center for Public Integrity. At least 21 of the top 25 subprime lenders were financed by these same banks that received the bailout money through direct ownership, credit agreements or huge purchases of loans for securitization. They're all tied together.

And 21 of the top 25 subprime lenders have closed, stopped lending or been sold to avoid bankruptcy. Most were nonbank lenders. They didn't go bankrupt. They're letting the American people go bankrupt. Bailed out, getting bigger and bigger, they now have over 40 percent of the deposits in this country. These four banks plus one more. Think about that. What's happening to our country? And they're not being held responsible. Say, that's not bad work if you can get it.

Wall Street bankers create these unsavory schemes, reap huge profits from our people and advantage their companies while driving our economy, home prices, and the Nation's housing stock and the American people into the ground.

My colleagues, take a look at this lineup. Isn't it over time for Congress to finally hold Wall Street accountable?

#### DEPARTMENT OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago I introduced a bill that would rename the Department of the Navy to be known as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. This bill has passed the House for 8 years in what is called



the armed services bill. It has been supported by the former Armed Services chairman, Duncan Hunter, and is now being supported by the current chairman of the Armed Services Committee, IKE SKELTON.

For 8 years, the Senate has said “no” to the Marine Corps, that you do not deserve this recognition. Mr. Speaker, I think that’s very sad. This year I am pleased to say to the House that with the help of 362 House Members who have joined me in legislation to rename this Department to be known as the Department of Navy and Marine Corps, and with the help of Chairman IKE SKELTON, we are hoping to send this bill to the Senate and let the Senate debate and think about the importance of honoring one fighting team.

Whenever we’ve held hearings on the Armed Services Committee, the CNO of the Navy, an admiral, and the commandant of the Marine Corps are there together saying, We’re one fighting team. Well, if you’re one fighting team, why don’t you do what the Navy football team does, and that is to say, You both are recognized.

Mr. Speaker, I want to hold up a jersey from the Navy football team that I received, and this is the jersey of this year’s team. I want to congratulate the team. They’ve had an excellent season. They’ve won a bowl, and I am very proud of them. On the left sleeve of the jersey is the Marine emblem, and on the right sleeve of the jersey is an anchor.

□ 1630

They understand at Annapolis that they are one fighting team, in this case a football team.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of other points I would like to make before closing. There are many medals that are named Navy and Marine Corps, such as Navy and Marine Corps Medal, Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal, Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, Navy and Marine Corps Good Conduct Medal, Navy and Marine Corps Expeditionary Medal, and Navy and Marine Corps Recruiting Service Ribbon.

And, Mr. Speaker, in 1959, the football field at Annapolis went from being known as the Navy Memorial Stadium to the Navy and Marine Corps Memorial Stadium.

Mr. Speaker, on a very serious note why this is so important, it is not only symbolism, but I am showing to my left an actual letter that was sent to the wife of a Marine captain who was killed in Iraq. This is a duplication of the letter. It says: The Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D.C., Navy flag extends its condolences to the marine’s wife. If this becomes law, Mr. Speaker, what the condolence letter would then say, the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps, Navy flag and Marine flag extends its condolences.

It is time that the Senate follows the House and let’s do what is right for the Marine Corps and give them the proper respect. Let’s make them part of the

family and part of one fighting team, the Navy and Marine Corps.

God bless our men and women in uniform; God bless their families; God bless the families who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan and Iraq; and may God continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### REMEMBERING DARLA SMALLWOOD-WRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of the Third Congressional District of Florida and myself, I rise today to remember and honor the life of someone very dear to me, my congressional office, and so many people here in the Washington, D.C. area, as well as many, many people of the Third Congressional District of Florida: my scheduler, office manager, and executive assistant, Mrs. Darla Smallwood-Wran, who passed away from breast cancer this morning.

When I came to Washington and hired the scheduler of my predecessor, Congressman Charlie Bennett, I thought at the time she was overpaid. Quickly, however, I began to realize that there was no dollar amount that could be placed on the value of Darla. A scheduler, office manager, I discovered very quickly is the foundation of an effective congressional office. And Darla, with her strong, persistent personality, her organizational skills, dotting every “i” and crossing every “t,” she never missed a beat. For 17 years, Darla was the face of my Washington office.

I want to say to her family, her father who is a police officer here, her mother and sisters and her loving husband, we love her, we can’t replace her, and we will deeply, deeply miss her.

As many times as I would have to change my flights, as often as the vote schedule changed, as frequently as meetings had to be coordinated, updated, rearranged, Darla was ever dependable, and always cool-headed, making everyone feel that the situation was always under control, even as my other staffers nervously buzzed in and out of the room.

Everyone who came in knew her, and certainly knew not to lean on her desk, touch the plants on her desk or worse than anything, interrupt her if she was on a call. I think everyone would agree that Darla was loved, and respected, by everyone who came into contact with her.

Her unmistakable smile, witty sense of humor and love of life blew fresh air and positive energy into the office.

My heart and prayers go out to Darla and to her family, in particular her mother and father, her sisters, and her loving husband Channing.

You are irreplaceable Darla, and you will be deeply missed.

In addition, I want to say that I am in support of the Haitian resolution before the House. I have always said to whom God has given much, much is expected. My thoughts and prayers go out to the people of the island of Haiti and to the Haitian community who live here in the United States and around the world. The loss of life and destruction of property in Haiti is unthinkable.

I want to thank the ministers, the business community, the organizations that have organized in our community, the Third Congressional District. We have seven tractor-trailers that will be going to Haiti filled with water, baby formula, dry cereal, blankets, tents, and sleeping bags. I want to say that the Royal Caribbean cruise line is carrying those goods over free of cost. I am very encouraged how the community is coming together to help the people of Haiti, and I can truly say, if you are interested in being helpful, go to the Web site and see how you can also participate.

In closing, I really do believe to whom God has given much, much is expected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### FREE COMPETITION IN CURRENCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to talk about a piece of legislation that I have recently introduced. That legislation is H.R. 4248. It is called the Free Competition in Currency Act. I believe long term this is a piece of legislation that will play an important role in the monetary reform that will be a necessity if we continue to do what we have been doing with our economy and our financial system.

We are in the middle of a financial crisis today. Some people think we have turned a corner, but, quite frankly, I do not believe that has occurred. Recently, though, we have just had the opening bells of an inquiry into what the cause of the crisis has been. It is the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission. It is a take-off of the Pecora Commission that was established in the 1930s to figure out why the crash occurred then. Of course, that commission met and talked to people. They tried to figure out what was the matter. And from my viewpoint, they came down with all of the wrong conclusions. They said that the Federal Reserve was

involved, that the Federal Reserve didn't print enough money fast enough and they didn't have a big enough bailout package and they needed a lot more regulation.

So they did all of those things for the first time in our history, under the two administrations, the Hoover and the Roosevelt administrations, and they prolonged the Depression. They took a 1-year depression/recession and turned it into a 15-year depression.

So I believe what we are going through right now is the same old song and dance. We are doing the same thing again. We have this new inquiry, and the members of the commission are people who didn't see it coming, didn't explain it, and didn't anticipate it. And the people who are coming before the commission, as far as I can see so far, had no anticipation or are acting surprised that the crisis came and that there was a bubble. So I can hardly see any good results coming from this.

My position over the many years has been that the Federal Reserve is a dangerous organization because it creates the bubble. Our country would be better off with a strong central bank like the Federal Reserve. I argue from a moral, economic, and a constitutional viewpoint that it has no right to exist and it is very dangerous to us.

I am very pleased, though, that one of the pieces of legislation I introduced, H.R. 1207, to audit the Federal Reserve, has met with a large amount of support. We have 316 cosponsors of that bill, and I think that is a major step in the right direction, looking to the Federal Reserve for the cause of our problem: the easy money system, the easy credit, the fixing of interest rates too low.

Now, the reason I am addressing this is because I believe the correction has a long way to run and that eventually we will have to have monetary reform. Now, in spite of my position being that we don't need the Federal Reserve, I am not in favor of closing the Federal Reserve down in one day or two. But I do believe the monetary system will close down this government and the monetary system and the Federal Reserve and a lot of other things if we continue on our profligate ways of spending and borrowing and inflating the currency and regulating the currency, and this will get much worse until we have a total collapse of the system.

So my bill, what it does is it introduces competition, competition in currencies. The Federal Reserve system and the dollar standard is run by a cartel, a monopoly. They don't allow competition because they know that they can't compete. Just as we have competition in the post office with FedEx and UPS, I think that the Federal Reserve deserves a little competition. The public school system has competition with private schools and it has competition with home schooling. There is no reason in the world that we can't enforce the Constitution, legalize the

Constitution and say that we can have competitions in currencies, but there are three major things that we must do to do that, and the bill does this. We repeal legal tender laws and remove the monopoly control of the Federal Reserve. We legalize private mints so mints can mint coins, and they will be controlled by fraud laws and anticounterfeit laws.

Today, our government commits fraud and counterfeit by printing money at will. If a private organization did that, they would be imprisoned for the fraud they are causing.

But the other important reform that would have to occur for money to circulate and compete against the monopoly control of the Federal Reserve would be to take taxes off money. The Constitution says only gold and silver can be money, only that can be legal tender, so you can't tax it and allow it to be competitive.

So these things could occur, and if nobody wanted to use it they wouldn't have to and everybody could be happy with the Federal Reserve. But if the conditions get so chaotic and the people are looking for an alternative, they can go and start operating in another currency.

So this to me could provide a smooth transition. It would not be chaotic. It would be legalized in the Constitution. It would be good, sound economics; and, eventually, the most important thing it would do, it would restrain the spending of this Congress, because as long as you have a Federal Reserve over there willing to print up the money any time we spend more money that we don't have and we can't borrow, then the Federal Reserve will accommodate us. Therefore, I argue the case for competition in currency and strictly limit it in government.

#### STUPAK-PITTS AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last month I wrote Speaker PELOSI and insisted that the Stupak-Pitts amendment be preserved in any final version of health care reform legislation. The Stupak-Pitts amendment would maintain the current policy of preventing Federal funds, taxpayer dollars, from paying for elective abortion. This question is even more crucial after passage of H.R. 3590, the Senate health care bill, which allows Federal funds to subsidize elective abortion. Unfortunately, the Speaker has yet to respond to my inquiry.

So this week, the same week as the annual March for Life in Washington, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and I are again sending a request to the Speaker: Madam Speaker, please respond to our request for information regarding your intentions on the Stupak-Pitts amendment in health care reform negotiations. We continue to in-

sist that you keep the exact language of that amendment which passed this House by a wide, bipartisan margin in any final version of health care legislation. Please do not ignore the voice of the American people or their Representatives on this very important issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### DIFFERENT FEDERAL APPROACH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by offering the congratulations of myself and many others to Senator-elect SCOTT BROWN of Massachusetts who had a very exciting victory yesterday. And I know that he will be a good Senator for the people of that State, but his victory means so much more to so many more people, not only the people of Massachusetts who are very excited today, but also people all across the country because they viewed the election of Senator BROWN as an opportunity to send a message to this government, to this Congress, and to say to the Speaker of the House and the majority leader in the Senate and others that we need to take a different approach to health care reform and to the general direction of our Federal Government with regard to the out-of-control spending that we are experiencing here in Washington: last year's Federal deficit of \$1.4 trillion and another \$1.2 trillion projected for this year; in fact, for each year as far as the eye can see, deficits exceeding \$600 billion a year as far out as we project them, 10 years from now.

□ 1645

At no time does this Congress offer a budget to the American people that would give them hope that we are going to get this problem under control. Instead, they have offered health care legislation that costs another, oh, some would say \$800 billion. But the reality is that over 10 years the real cost of this legislation is more like \$2 trillion-plus when you add in the fact that the taxes begin on this legislation sooner than the benefits begin.

And cuts in Medicare are unreal at a time when we are going to see a dramatic increase in the number of people

in this country who are eligible for Medicare, as the baby boomers start retiring this year, 2010, those born after World War II start retiring this year, and the number of people who are on Medicare and eligible for Medicare is going to skyrocket.

With all of this going on, the message to this Congress, to the Democratic leadership in this Congress is you need to change course, change direction, and make sure that you are reflecting the will of the American people. But instead, the leadership doesn't get that message. Even today, as Senator-elect BROWN prepares to come down here to be sworn into the United States Senate sometime in the next few days, the White House and Democratic Congressional leaders have once again retreated behind closed doors to make deals and finalize a single version of their government takeover of health care. That is not what the American people want.

Speaker PELOSI said today, in response to the election results, "Clearly the election results last night spell out that we have not been as clear about our deficit reduction measures. And that will change." But the American people want to know what deficit reduction measures is she talking about when she continues, along with the other Democratic leaders here in the House and in the Senate and at the White House, to plot the expenditure of \$2 trillion or more in additional expenditures over the next 10 years for a health care bill that robs Medicare recipients, that increases taxes, and will cost American jobs, that will do a whole host of things to regulate Americans' lives and how they will receive their health insurance, including mandating that they have to purchase health insurance whether or not they feel they want to, and telling them pretty much what that insurance is that they are going to have to purchase because of the fact that this health insurance will be regulated by a Federal Government health insurance commissioner, one of the more than 140 new Federal Government agencies and programs included under consideration in the bill that they are planning to try to move forward.

That is simply not what the American people are looking for. They want responsible leadership. They want a bipartisan effort to deal with this challenge of rising costs of health insurance and health care. And they want bipartisan, responsible leadership in looking to ways to make health insurance and health care available to more people.

The legislation they are considering doesn't do that. Instead, it busts the budget of our country. Yesterday's election results in Massachusetts calls for a new direction in health care and in that debate. Many believe the election of Senator SCOTT BROWN lessens the likelihood of passage of the current proposal that has been crafted by Democratic leadership. If this is indeed

the case, Democrats and Republicans must work together toward health care reform that reduces costs and expands insurance coverage without reducing costs or adding to the national debt, rationing care, or putting the Federal Government between the patient and their doctor.

One such bill to consider is H.R. 3970, the Medical Rights and Reform Act, of which I am a cosponsor. The Medical Rights and Reform Act includes fiscally responsible health care reforms like medical liability reform, small business insurance pooling, and letting families and businesses buy insurance across state lines. These are ideas at that have strong bipartisan support, but have been absent from the bicameral health care negotiations. Most important, the Medical Rights and Reform Act is fiscally responsible. This alternative does not raise taxes, cut Medicare, or add to the deficit. And it lowers health care costs.

This Congress already gave us a \$1.8 trillion debt. America cannot afford to spend another trillion dollars or \$2 trillion as proposed by the majority, and our families cannot afford to put life and death decisions in the hands of bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, resetting the health care debate and working together in an open and transparent way would help Washington regain the public's trust.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GRAYSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### DEFICIT COMMISSION BY EXECUTIVE ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Today the press, Mr. Speaker, is reporting that a backroom deal has been cut with Democratic leadership to create a deficit cutting commission by executive order. I oppose this effort, and so will the American people.

In light of this news, the remarks that Representative LAMAR SMITH of Texas made on the House floor this morning ring truer and more urgent than ever. Representative SMITH offered a series of lessons to be learned from yesterday's special Senate election in Massachusetts. He said all true reform starts with the voice of the people. The people will not have a choice in a deficit commission established by executive order. He also said common sense trumps partisanship. A commission through executive order negotiated by one party is the height of partisanship. He also said voters can exercise real independence. Where is the voice of the people in a process that will not go beyond the Beltway?

Mr. SMITH correctly noted that one-party control leads to arrogance. We are seeing today an arrogance of power on a party that forecloses the minority from a seat at the table. To be fair, the Republicans in the majority were arrogant at times. And Mr. SMITH concluded that we should be listening to the people, not defying them. The people of Massachusetts spoke yesterday. They proved that when the people get mad enough, anything is possible, even in Massachusetts. Lawmakers in Congress on both sides of the aisle would be wise to hear that message loud and clear, yet the Obama administration doesn't seem to be listening.

There are a number of serious problems being exposed as details of the administration's executive order commission are revealed. Any commission should be authentically bipartisan, passed by the Congress. Press reports indicate that instead of putting every spending program and tax policy on the table, discretionary spending would be exempt. How can we have an honest conversation about the Nation's financial health without looking at discretionary funds that accounted for more than 33 percent of Federal spending in '09?

The \$447 billion omnibus appropriations bill that was considered by Congress and signed into law in December corresponded with the Democrats' budget blueprint that increased non-defense discretionary spending by 12 percent over the previous year. When all appropriations spending is combined, the Democratic majority will have increased nondefense, non-veterans discretionary spending by 85 percent over the last 2 fiscal years. The American household has certainly not seen their income rise by 85 percent in recent years.

Simply put, discretionary spending, with the spending set by annual appropriations levels of Congress, matter. A deficit reduction commission that is barred from looking at one-third of the Federal budget is a fig leaf. The bipartisan commission process I have talked about for nearly 4 years puts everything, entitlements, tax policy, discretionary spending, everything on the table for discussion by the commission members.

Moreover, the American people will be cut out of the process under the President's plan. The SAFE Commission plan I have advocated for includes legitimate public engagement, mandating public town hall-style meetings. But under President Obama's plan the public voice will be nonexistent. There will be no input from the hardworking taxpayers in our communities. This is not the right way to form public policy.

Perhaps the most glaring sleight of hand, one I believe the American people will recognize and refute, is that the Democratic leadership intends to bring the commission recommendations up for a vote in Congress, but only after the mid-term elections and

before the new Congress begins in 2011. It would be a lame duck vote.

Lawmakers who are retiring or get defeated could vote on a set of recommendations with regard to entitlement spending and tax policy, but never be held accountable by the American people. Is it right for outgoing Members of Congress to consider proposals that could affect every single American knowing that days and weeks later they would no longer be answerable to the voters of the district they once represented?

Between the Democrats and Republicans in both chambers, over 30 Members have already announced they are retiring or running for another office, and this number will grow. During the lame duck session, some outgoing Members may already be looking for new jobs, which could well be lobbying special interest groups and other stakeholders that have a vested interest in the outcome of the vote on the commission's recommendations. Yet the Obama administration is setting up a process that would allow these outgoing lawmakers to vote on the commission's recommendations and run the risk of blurring the lines between what is best for the American people and best for their future employer.

Any recommendation put forward should be considered by the newly elected Congress, which would have to publicly stand by their vote on the commission's recommendation. This Congress has run up the country's credit card to a point of no return, and now the administration wants to be able to tout a bipartisan solution to spending for political cover to survive the upcoming elections.

A commission through executive order is political gamesmanship. It is a blatant effort by the administration to find political cover after advocating for the \$787 billion economic stimulus, supporting health care reform being negotiated behind closed doors that could cost a trillion, and pushing other budget breakers that are wildly unpopular in the eyes of the American people.

In closing, the American people understand the depth of our financial problems. They recognize the spending gorge that Congress has embarked on since the Obama administration began, and they will not be fooled about by a fig leaf commission established by executive order. Just ask the people of Massachusetts.

#### MARCH FOR LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the March for Life, which will take place this Friday, January 22nd. It marks the 37th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision in *Roe v. Wade*. I will head to the march on Friday with the knowledge that abortions in this

country are declining: 1.21 million a year in 2005, the latest reliable figures available show, compared to 1.36 million some 10 years ago.

But hundreds of thousands of pilgrims will be here to deliver one message: There is a right to life. It is an integral part of the Declaration of Independence so painstakingly penned by our Founding Fathers.

Busloads of those marchers of all stripes will be from my district in Pennsylvania. They will be leaving home at very early hours that morning, and actually the night before to get here to stand for that cause, to stand for life. And they will be joining the gathering of pro-life Americans to march down Constitution until they reach the steps of the Supreme Court.

Abortion has been a part of the health care debate, and may still keep current bills from passing. No taxpayer should be forced to pay for abortions in this country. That policy has been reaffirmed many times by this Congress, and should not be changed for the current circumstances. And I ask my colleagues to join in this march on Friday, and to help celebrate the gift of life.

On December 2, 2009, I joined 39 of my House colleagues in sending Speaker PELOSI a letter regarding a prohibition on the government funding of abortion in the final version of the health care legislation.

□ 1700

A significant majority of Americans, both those that identify themselves as pro-life and pro-choice, are opposed to the government funding of abortions.

The Senate-passed health care bill, H.R. 1362, would require Federal funds to subsidize elective abortion. This plan differs greatly from the House version that maintains the current policy of preventing the Federal funding of abortion and for funding of health care benefit packages that include abortion.

Mr. Speaker, any health care reform proposals that this Chamber agrees to must always place a high value on protecting innocent life. These provisions should include the language found within the Stupak-Pitts amendment, which passed this Chamber by a wide bipartisan margin of 240-194.

Mr. Speaker, as we take up any health care, let us preserve the Founders' dedication to the principle of life.

#### DESECRATING DEMOCRACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would live to see the day when a commentator entrusted by a major broadcast network with the ability to reach millions of listeners would use his influence to incite voter fraud, but I'm afraid this week we passed that unfortunate milestone.

On Friday, January 15, MSNBC commentator Ed Schultz told his nationally syndicated radio audience, I tell you what, if I lived in Massachusetts I'd try to vote 10 times. I don't know if they'd let me or not, but I'd try to. Yeah, that's right. I'd cheat to keep these bastards out. I would.

Now, this could be dismissed as an unfortunate verbal excess brought on by the passion of the moment, except for the fact that when given the opportunity to retract the statement, Mr. Schultz embellished it in a way that makes it crystal clear that his words were deliberate and calculated. He said, I misspoke on Friday. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I meant to say, if I could vote 20 times, that's what I'd do.

Later he said, Let me be very clear, I'm not advocating voter fraud, I'm just telling you what I would do. Now, Mr. Speaker, exactly how does one not advocate voter fraud when three times on national broadcasts you say that's what you would do?

Mr. Speaker, this can only be interpreted as an incitement to commit voter fraud in a pivotal election in the course of our Nation. As such, it strikes at the very foundation of democratic traditions and our constitutional institutions. In every election, win, lose or draw, it is of utmost importance that the vote be fair, that it be accurate, and that it have the confidence of every citizen, both those in the majority as well as those in the minority. If we cannot trust the sanctity of the vote, we destroy the legitimacy of that vote—and with it the legitimacy of that government.

All of our governing institutions and all of their acts rest about a single foundation—fair and free elections which guarantee that those who exercise authority under our Constitution do so deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. It is this principle that Mr. Schultz has sought to desecrate and demean. His statements excusing voter fraud weaken the single most important mechanism of our democracy and undermine our form of government. His words deserve—indeed, they demand—the contempt and condemnation of every American. And they deserve immediate action by those who have accorded him his broadcast platforms and whose silence and inaction thus far can only be described as a disgrace.

#### HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Good afternoon. Once again, we find ourselves here on the floor of the U.S. Congress and the subject before us, in spite of various events that have been of great interest to people yesterday—I'm thinking of the election of Massachusetts—still remains the question of health care.

There is discussion with the new political realignments that it may be that the House will take up and just pass the bill that was passed by the Senate. That is one possibility, which then of course would require the bill not to have to go back to the Senate.

And so we come back to this question of health care in America, something that has a lot of people's attention. It's not the top priority I think for many people. I think many people are worried about unemployment, they're worried about the economy, they're worried about excessive government spending, they're worried about terrorism and national security. But underneath those, perhaps, there is still some concern about health care, but particularly a fear that in an attempt to try to solve a problem we may make a bad situation worse. Indeed, when government does too much, we have found that we sometimes get some very bad side effects—inferior quality, inefficient allocation of goods, bureaucratic rationing, and of course excessive expenses.

Now, if health care is expensive now, just wait until it's free, some have said. We were promised by our President, Here's what you need to know: First, I will not sign a plan that adds one dime to our deficits either now or in the future. Sounds pretty definitive. It sounds like he says, hey, I understand about the deficit, I understand about the debt, I understand about excessive spending, and I am not going to add one dime to our deficit.

Well, the bill that's being proposed does not add a dime, so I guess technically this statement is correct. It adds, rather, either one or several trillion dollars. That may be a whole lot worse than the dime. So this particular statement, along with some others that we've heard, is not really precise in terms of what has been proposed, particularly the Senate and the House versions that we have seen.

In order to try to put a package together, there have been some compromises made, as tends to happen when you're writing large and complex pieces of legislation. This protects insurance companies in kind of an odd way. The legislation that is being considered in the Senate preserves the legal immunity of large insurance companies in the event of negligence or any other wrongful action even if their action results in injury or death of a patient.

Now, this is the language that's in the bill. What does that really mean? What it means is something that I think most Americans consider to be very undesirable, and that is, you walk in and you feel sick and you go see your doctor. You trust your doctor, you've known your doctor for some period of time, and so you have the doctor take a look. He runs some tests and he says, well, now, Congressman AKIN, this is the news: You've got this, this, and this, and I recommend we do this. And you check with him, ask a bunch

of questions and say good, that seems like a good course of action.

Now, here's where the train comes off the tracks. Your insurance company says, but we don't really think that's necessary, we're not that concerned about you, Congressman AKIN. And your doctor, well, you know, he's probably being pretty cautious, but he's also being pretty expensive. And so we're going to say you really don't need to go to the hospital for this, we're going to recommend you just stay home for a while and take some aspirin and see what develops. Now, that's what we call something or somebody getting in the way of the doctor-patient relationship.

In this country, we have gotten spoiled. We have enjoyed contact with our doctors. We have enjoyed the process of getting to know the doctors and trusting them and soliciting their opinion. At times, we get multiple opinions from different doctors just to make sure. But we don't want some insurance company coming between the patient and the doctor; that's pretty bad when that happens. What's worse is when the government comes between you and your doctor. That's what a full-born socialized medicine bill will do.

This bill here says that these insurance companies can basically second-guess the doctors, and if things go wrong, guess what? They have no liability. Is that what we want in health care reform? I don't think so. Doctors can be sued if they make a bad diagnosis, but not insurance companies, even when they get in between the patient and the doctor. Is that something we want in a health care bill? I don't think so. And that's one of the reasons why a lot of Americans don't want this massive government takeover to pass, because it has these little loopholes like this in it. I don't think many of you would have known that that was in the bill, and yet it is.

There are also some other problems. We have a bill, when you start to get thousands of pages of legislation, there is a lot of room for mistakes and an awful lot of creation of bureaucracy. I don't know what the latest version of this is because a lot of this is negotiated behind closed doors, but we're talking about close to a 2,000-page bill passed with I don't know how many hours of public review—72 hours would be nice, I'm not so sure we'll have that. We have not had that on other major pieces of legislation.

This particular bill creates 118 new boards—that sounds like some bureaucracy, doesn't it—commissions and programs full of new mandates. One of the things in legislation that people who are legislators pay attention to is how many "you musts" and "you shalls" and "you've got to's" there are in a bill. This one contains the word "shall" 3,425 times. Obviously somebody has very strong opinions about what other Americans ought to do, and they're going to mandate it. And so

you have here quite a large bill, many, many pages, 3,425 "shalls," 118 new boards.

We tried to draw a picture of what that would look like. Now, you know they say a picture is worth a thousand words. I don't know if this picture is worth 1,000 or 2,000 pages, but this is an attempt at drawing a picture of what we've got. And the more you look at it, the more you look at all these colored boxes, which are some of the new agencies and all, it starts to look more and more like some sort of a maze. And you kind of wonder whether what's going on is, the consumers or people who are sick are somehow trying to get across this maze to find their doctor. It's almost like something you would be given at a restaurant with a Crayon, and you're supposed to plot the path, if you're a patient, to somehow get over to see the doctor. But this is the kind of complexity that is being created by what has been proposed over the last 7 or 8 months by the Democrats.

The reason this is so complicated is because of the overall strategic approach that health care started, and that was the idea that we're going to take what we have and pretty much pitch it, and we're going to redesign the whole thing and put the government in charge of it. So we're not going to go in and fix this or that that's broken; we're going to basically scrap it and start over.

Consequently, the result is a very complicated piece of legislation for the government to try to take over what is essentially close to one-fifth of the U.S. economy.

So that's one of the things that people are concerned with and one of the reasons why, not so much based on political party, but just based on good old American commonsense, there is a concern for the complexity and of course the cost associated with that complexity.

We don't like mandates a whole lot. Americans tend to be a little bit free-wheeling, and they're not too much into following all the dots and tittles and all the little nuances of laws and rules. Americans like to have some freedom, a little bit of elbow room, a little flexibility. So when we're talking about the mandate, we're saying, here, there's mandates in this bill. All those "shalls" come into things that restrict your freedom. One of the mandates is that employers must offer a qualified health care plan to full- and part-time employees.

So we're saying to companies, we don't care what you think is good for your employees, and we don't really care what your employees think is good for them; what we're going to do is tell you how it's got to be. And so we are going to write what your health care plan has to look like, and then, Mr. Employer, you have to offer what we're writing up for you to your employees.

□ 1715

That is an interesting approach. We think of it in terms of the idea of a top-down, Big Government solution because the government is going to tell you what you need. Whether you think you know what you need doesn't make any difference. It's going to be a top-down status mandate, and you will pay for 65 to 72 percent of the cost of the plan.

So we're going to tell you what kind of plan you're going to offer. By the way, you're going to pay for it, and if you don't pay for it, we're going to penalize you, and we're going to hit you with a tax of up to 8 percent of your payroll costs. So whoever you are, even fairly small businesses, you know, in terms of what the cutoff is in this, you're going to get hit with 8 percent of your payroll taxes. In fact, if you have 100 employees, if 99 of them want this qualified plan and one does not, the way the bill is written is that you're going to end up paying this 8 percent because everybody has to agree to what the government has mandated.

So there are some mandates in here which, from a small business point of view, are considered fairly onerous. It's another thing which makes the bill offensive and not popular.

Now, one of the concerns is, when the government takes something over, it tends to cost money. The President said it's not going to cost a dime. I suppose that's true. It's supposed to cost over \$1 trillion, but there are a lot of hidden costs. You see, you bury the costs of some things that you don't want to show. Trying to keep it under \$1 trillion was a tough thing to do; \$1 trillion is a fair amount of money. Even for the U.S. Federal Government, \$1 trillion is a lot of money.

We spent about \$1.4 trillion last year. That was about what our level of debt was, \$1.4 trillion. The highest debt that we'd had before that was under President Bush in 2008. During the Pelosi Congress here in 2008, we had just south of \$500 billion in deficit spending that year. So, if deficit spending of 400 and—whatever it is—50 or 60 billion was a lot, \$1.4 trillion in deficit spending was a considerable amount. So our deficit in '09 tripled from '08, and it was a \$1 trillion-plus, \$1.5 trillion.

Well, here is \$1 trillion for this little plan. This is not small if you're worried about Federal spending. The estimate here is it's going to raise taxes \$729 billion. If we got away with that few in tax increases, we might be doing well. It increases the long-term cost of medical care by \$289 billion. Again, I think those are conservative estimates. It creates shortages, higher costs, more regulations, more patients, and a fixed supply of medical professionals.

This is part of the CMS Report. CMS is a group of staffers who are not connected with a political party. They take a look at legislation, and they try to come up with what the costs are and how it's going to work. Of course, there's a lot of argument about what

they count and about what they don't count; but things like creating shortages and also considerable amounts of unemployment are expected to come from this because, if you mandate that businesses spend a lot of money, what happens is it means their employees are going to cost more. If their employees are going to cost more, there's an incentive for them to get rid of some employees and to run the employees they have for longer hours. That reduces their costs, which of course increases unemployment.

So this bill will affect unemployment, which is another reason people are not very pleased with it and are disappointed in the bill. There is an inefficiency and an expense here which is quite considerable.

There is another mandate. This is one on individuals. It says that individuals must buy acceptable health insurance coverage. Now, guess who defines what health insurance coverage is acceptable if you're an individual citizen of the United States?

Is it the individual citizen? Is it the 22-year-old who says, I can't afford health insurance right now, and I'm very healthy and I'm making the decision not to get health insurance? Is he the one who decides what acceptable health insurance coverage is?

Of course, the answer is "no." The answer is that the Federal Government knows what you need better than you do, so the Federal Government is going to mandate that you have this coverage, and they're going to tell you what kind of coverage it is, and you've got to buy it.

Now, this raises kind of an interesting legal point, which is, if the government mandates that you have something or that you buy something, is that not really, essentially, a tax increase? When you mandate that somebody has to buy a particular product, is that something that the Federal Government should be doing in this particular area? Is it even constitutional? When it is a mandate, is it not just essentially a tax increase? Or pay an additional 2.5 of your income in taxes. So now you're going to have a choice. You can either buy the insurance that we know is best for you—Big Brother government—or you can pay a fine or face criminal penalties, including jail time and severe fines if you don't get in line with what we know is best for you.

Who is "we"? Oh, we just saw a picture of the "we," didn't we? Here is the "we." We know what's best for you. All of this matrix of bureaucracy, this matrix run by the Federal Government, really knows what's good for you, and so we're going to tell you what it is that you have to buy. You've got to buy the insurance we tell you you've got to buy. Otherwise, you'll face criminal penalties, including jail time.

How do you think that goes over with a lot of freedom-loving Americans? Well, not very good.

I think some of the election results that we've seen in the last number of

months reflect the fact that people are not that comfortable with Washington, D.C.—Big Government—playing God in everybody's lives. That's one of the concerns and why this is not particularly popular.

I notice that we have joining us this evening a doctor, somebody who has spent years in the health care profession and who has really been in the middle of it as to providing that doctor-patient relationship. He knows the subject far better than this poor, old engineer does, and I would like to yield some time to my good friend who has just joined me on this health care topic. I was just running through some of the reasons why people aren't that excited about this Big Government takeover of health care and why you're seeing a lot of people voting, saying, I'm not sure we're on the right track with this.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank you for yielding.

As Congressman AKIN has said, I've spent the last 31 years, until a year ago, practicing medicine in Johnson City, Tennessee, and really in a rural area in Appalachia. I've also practiced medicine in Memphis, in the inner-city, while I was in training and in school.

We have to back up, I think, and look at what the problem was, what problem are we trying to solve.

In this country, I just saw a poll recently that showed among likely voters that approximately 90, 91 percent of the folks had some form of health insurance. What we're getting confused with is there are people out there who don't have access to care. There is no question about that, and we need to address that problem.

What we've been hearing in this particular H.R. 3962, aka H.R. 3200 that we began to deal with, is that this is the only solution, which is this very complex health care bill, which I've read—I've read all 2,000 pages of it—and you have very adequately stated some of the problems. What are we trying to fix?

Well, we have 40-plus million people in America who do not have—not access to care, because a law was passed in 1986 called EMTALA, and that afforded every American, whether you're legal or not—you could be an illegal citizen in this country—or whether you could pay or not. If you go to a hospital with an emergency room, you have to be cared for. We have no choice. When I was on call in the emergency room—and believe me—I'm the one who had to get up at 3 a.m. in the morning and go see these patients and care for them. So the care was there. It's just not the most efficient way to provide the care. There is no question about that.

We have a system in this country now where costs are out of control, and I think that's what this bill doesn't do. It doesn't address the fear that most of



us have and that I know I had as a doctor and that I have as a consumer of health care, which is the ever-rising cost of the care.

We can do several things. Let me just point out, in the 2,600- or 2,700-page Senate bill, I can cover 20 million people on one page. This is just to show you how simple you can make it. Number one, if you have signed up the people currently who are eligible for the State Children's Health Insurance plan and they've just not signed up for a current plan that's already there in Medicaid, you would cover 10 to 12 million people.

There's one thing in this bill that I do like a lot, and that's to allow adult children, when they graduate from high school or college who don't have health insurance, to stay on their parents' plans, their parents' health care plans. You could cover 7 million young people. You could cover almost 20 million people in this country. I don't think either side, the Democrats or the Republicans, would mind doing that. You've covered two-thirds of what the Senate bill is going to do by doing that one thing, and you can do that on one page.

Mr. AKIN. Could I just reclaim my time for just a minute, Dr. ROE?

The way you're approaching this seems to be a little bit more sane in some ways in that you're saying, look, we're going to define our problem precisely, and we're going to tailor a solution to try to improve what we've got in order to try to make the system work.

Now, you're not proposing—I thought it was 2,000 pages. You're saying it's coming up close to 3,000 now. You're not proposing a 3,000-page or 2,000-page solution. You're talking about one simple thing, and you can take half of the people who don't have health insurance, and you can get them insurance.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. AKIN. You can do that on one page.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. On one page.

Mr. AKIN. Now, I think the American public prefers simple and to just fix what's broken instead of scrapping everything and starting over, but I yield to my good friend from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Another issue that we deal with all the time—and as a physician, I would deal with this—are patients who would develop, let's say, breast cancer and lose their jobs. Then they would lose their insurance coverage. Now they have chronic conditions, and they don't have insurance coverage. How do you help those patients? How do you help those folks?

Well, this is a very simple problem. Preexisting conditions are a problem but not in the large group market. In other words, if you've worked for a large corporation or let's say—like we get our insurance here through the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan, the so-called FEHBP. You've got 9 million people who get their insurance through that. If one person has a

chronic condition like breast cancer or diabetes, it really doesn't affect our rates because you spread those risks over millions of people. If you would simply get rid of State lines and if you would allow small groups to become big groups, you then solve the preexisting condition problem.

The second thing you can do is to subsidize—

Mr. AKIN. I don't mean to interrupt you, and I don't want to be rude, but I just want you to develop that point a little bit more.

In other words, am I understanding, Doctor, that what you're saying is you could buy insurance across State lines? Is that the point you're making?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Reclaiming my time, absolutely.

Look, you can buy any other kind of insurance in the world but health insurance across a State line. Why in the world should it make any difference? If I'm living near the State line—and we're surrounded by multiple States in Tennessee—I should be able to buy that insurance across a State line.

For instance, let's take Realtors. Almost every Realtor's business is a small business. They have six, eight, ten. Twenty would be a lot in our area. Let them all group together across this Nation, and then you'll have 500,000 or 1 million Realtors who could spread their risks, and you wouldn't have any government involvement. You wouldn't have any subsidies involved. You wouldn't have any complications. You'd simply let the free market system work.

Mr. AKIN. Doctor, reclaiming my time again, what you're saying is you're combining a couple of ideas, but you're saying it fast. I want to make sure people can understand it.

The first thing you're saying is you can buy insurance across State lines. Particularly if you live in a place like, for instance, Kansas City, Missouri—and there's a Kansas City, Kansas, right across the river—you could be buying insurance out of two markets instead of one or even possibly from someplace like all the way up in Massachusetts. So that's one idea.

As to your other idea, though, it sounds like what you're saying is you're allowing the individuals, let's say, who work for some small employer to pool together to create large pools, which then gives you the statistical smoothing so that you could apply for insurance, one, because you have a whole lot of buyers. You're a significant player, so you can buy at a discount price. Second of all, if somebody does get ill, you can smooth that load over a big enough base that it doesn't affect it. Am I understanding you correctly?

I yield.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding. You're absolutely right, because what you allow it to do is you allow a small business to become a large business.

Like I said, the problem with preexisting conditions is, if you have a

small shop of 5, 10, 20 employees, which many businesses have—and 70 percent of our employees in this country work for small businesses. If you have one very expensive condition that hits, it breaks them. They can't afford insurance. That's why it's not affordable.

Some other things we could easily do are preventative care, and you could do that where you have different incentives to keep yourself well.

□ 1730

As a physician, I can tell you all day long how to stay well, but it is up to you as a patient to carry that out. I can give you all the great ideas in the world, but if you don't carry them out, then it doesn't do any good.

Mr. AKIN. It is about that third helping of french fries, I understand.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That is correct. So you want to have the incentives built into our health care system.

For instance, a health savings account. I have one, a health savings account. Let me explain this to our audience today, the people who are watching this.

Before, when you pay a premium in, if you don't use it, who keeps the money? The insurance company does. In my case right here, with a health savings account, you put in X dollars. In our office, it is \$3,000. It can be \$5,000 that your employer puts in that account for you. You pay everything first dollar, so I am highly motivated to take care of myself, because at the end of the year, if I don't spend that money, I get to keep that money, not the insurance company. And you can roll that money over and use it the following year and the following year.

In our group, we have 350 employees in our medical group at home, and for those who get insurance, over 80 percent of them choose a health savings account. They manage their own care, so they are motivated not to smoke and to exercise and to lose weight because they save their own money. You can use that money later in your life if you accumulate many thousands of dollars for long-term care or whatever you want. You are the insurance company.

Mr. AKIN. Doctor, again, I would like to cut in for a minute here. You are talking about a medical savings account. What you are saying makes a whole lot of sense.

In other words, what you do is you put your money aside, and you have some tax benefits from setting it aside, into not something for your retirement but something to help cover your medical needs. Then, as medical expenses come up during the year, you can pay for those out of this pre-tax money which is in your medical savings account.

If you stay healthy and you have a good lifestyle and you didn't have that third helping of french fries, then you may not spend as much money as you put in there and you would be allowed to keep it year in and year out, and it

could continue to earn interest to cover in case of a medical problem.

Is that right so far?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That is correct. And if something were to happen catastrophically, let's say you have an accident or a heart attack and you spend more than that predetermined amount, you buy catastrophic coverage that covers every bit of it.

For instance, in my particular case, anything over \$5,000 is paid for 100 percent. And you had the \$5,000 to begin with, it was your money, so you got to keep it. I think that is a very simple thing that we are currently doing and we should be encouraging people to do, not discouraging.

Mr. AKIN. Now, my understanding is we put that into law, but there were a lot of limitations on it, and I don't think that is generally available for most people in the public. Is it, Doctor?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. It is not, and it should be.

Mr. AKIN. Is that a problem that the marketplace hasn't caught up to what the law says? Or, are there roadblocks that make it so that people can't do that?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I think probably we haven't educated our public as much as we should have. I was surprised in my own practice about how many chose to do that once they understood it.

When you are faced with paying \$3,000, that is kind of scary to do that when you normally have a small copay or deductible. But once you understand how it works, that you get to keep the money, not the insurance company—and while we are on insurance companies, I have got a problem.

I know one of the things that I did in practice that really frustrated me to no end was to have insurance companies deny needed care for patients, and I think certainly they are culpable. I know I have spent as much time on the phone sometimes getting a case approved for a patient to get needed care as I did actually doing the procedure I was trying to get approved. That is very frustrating. So the insurance company is culpable out there, and we do need some reform.

Mr. AKIN. Doctor, we just talked about that. One of the first slides I brought up was starting, when you want to talk about health insurance, one thing that you want is you want to have that doctor-patient relationship kept—I don't know if you would call it sacred, but you want that to be a primary kind of consideration. And if an insurance company parks itself between the patient and the doctor, we don't like that idea very well.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. No, we don't.

Mr. AKIN. And with this bill that is being proposed, the insurance company can second-guess the doctor, and if there is a bad result, they can't be sued. That is one more strike why people don't like this bill. But that is a great point.

We have been joined by another colleague of mine, Congressman THOMP-

SON. G.T. is here, just a stalwart, free-enterprise guy, and somebody with a whole lot of common sense. I would like to yield some time, if you would like to comment.

We are trying to take an overview of what is happening now, after the election yesterday, and where we are in this whole thing of health care and are we still under this model of Big Brother is going to take it all over.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend from Missouri and my good friend from Tennessee for this Special Order tonight that you are doing.

Yesterday was a landmark day. I think it established a pretty confident trend of what the American people like and what they dislike. And what they dislike I think is properly captured and framed in that chart that you have on the tripod, the bureaucracy of a government-run, government takeover of health care.

We need to be approaching health care and we need to be approaching everything we do in this Chamber, I believe, from a principled leadership perspective, of leading with principles. And I have to tell you, and I suppose my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would agree with that. It is just their principles are completely 180 degrees from our principles. I have to imagine, what are the principles behind that health care nightmare that is outlined there? I liken it to a train going down a mountain with no brakes—it never ends well.

What they are trying to shove through is just to get anything, get something. I can imagine how the behind-closed-door discussions are going, which happened again today even after the people in Massachusetts spoke.

Mr. AKIN. All the complaints.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. It has to be something like this: "We don't care what it is, let's just pass something, whatever it might be." The goal is just to get something through to be able to say they did something. Well, that is wrong. That is not the approach we do. The American people need and deserve better than that. They want principles.

The health care principles I believe in and the Republican Party and some of my Democratic colleagues, I think we can work together. There are four principles I have always held dear as a health care professional for almost 30 years, and that is—and my belief is that we have a health care system that is pretty good. In fact, I would rate it one of the best in the world, not that it couldn't be improved upon. And the principles that we dedicate ourselves to are decreasing costs, increasing access, improving quality, and preserving that relationship that Dr. ROE talked about, the decisionmaking relationship between the physician and the patient, not allowing a bureaucrat to insert themselves into that relationship. And this certainly, I think, is regressive, regressive in terms of all four of those principles.

My colleague from Tennessee talked about the impact on the relationship of decisionmaking between the patient and the physician, where the bureaucracy, a bureaucrat is inserted between that relationship. But when you look at all of it, when you look at cost, the cost of the Senate bill, which I believe—I don't know, but that is what will be shoved at the American people and will be shoved at this Chamber to work on. The Congressional Budget Office showed those costs going up significantly. I believe the individual costs were at least, on the average, \$300 per year, \$2,100 per family. I thought the idea behind that is to lower costs for everyone, yet we know what is out there.

My colleagues have talked about allowing the purchase of health insurance across State lines. That is greater competition. That is a good thing. That brings costs down.

Certainly the whole issue of tort reform; \$29 billion a year that is spent in this Nation on tort reform premiums, \$29 billion. And we talk about waste and fraud, waste within health care spending. I think that is the biggest waste there is. Those dollars could be going into directly caring for patients. You add on top of that the cost of the practice of defensive medicine, and I understand why that occurs.

A physician comes out of medical school with a quarter million dollars of loans, if they are a specialist, maybe half a million dollars in loans. And at the risk of even a frivolous lawsuit they can lose a practice, lose their family's home. They order extra tests that may not be necessary to treat the illness at hand but does substantiate they followed a standard of practice, a standard of care.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, let me just mention a couple of things that my friend from Pennsylvania is talking about.

In 1975, all the malpractice companies left the State of Tennessee. We had nothing. So the physicians there brought together and formed what is called the State Volunteer Mutual Insurance Company. It was a mutual company that anything that wasn't paid out in premiums came back to us. Since the inception of that company in 1975, over half the premium dollars have gone to attorneys. Less than 40 cents on the dollar went to the injured parties, the injured patients, and about 10 cents to run the company.

We have a system that is broken terribly when you can't even compensate injured people. That is the system we have in America now, and that is wrong, because there are events that do occur that need to be compensated. We don't have a system that can even do that.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, gentlemen, what you have been outlining here today is, I think, what the American public is eager for. They are eager for people to define specifically what a problem is, and to outline a solution

that makes common sense, that isn't going to be that expensive. In fact, the solution should save money. They are going to increase the amount of freedom that consumers have and choices, and improve the quality of health care. That is a way to approach health care. That is to say, we are not going to totally destroy it all; we are going to fix the parts of it that are broken.

That is usually the way we approach most legislative questions. And yet, now, for to whatever it is, eight months, we have been running down this track trying to reproduce in America what has never worked in foreign countries very well.

I think you could say there are a lot of things we could fix in America. But, on the other hand, if you are the guy that lives in Dubai and you are worth a couple hundred million dollars and you get sick, guess where you want to be treated. You want to come to the good old USA.

So why do we want to scrap something that has many aspects? In fact, I would say if you take a look at the American health care system, if you look at what is being provided in care, we are doing pretty darned well. If you are taking a look at how are we paying for that, we have got some problems.

So our problems tend to be more in the pay for side than in the quality of the care that is coming out. And each of you gentlemen have demonstrated, I think very articulately, tonight the fact that there are some certain specific things that could be fixed, yet we seem to be just on this—you called it a train wreck—just trying to replace the whole thing with a Big Government solution.

And I think it is ironic, almost amusing, and a month or two ago would have been unbelievable, to say that this whole thing may well have been derailed by Massachusetts voting for a Republican for the U.S. Senate. If you said that 2 months ago, people would think you needed to be locked up in a little white straitjacket. They would say there is no chance that something like that could happen.

Yet people are starting to pay attention to what is being proposed here, and this, along with a whole series of other incidents and mismanagement, has created a political anomaly. I mean, there wasn't one Republican Congressman in the State of Massachusetts, and yet the State, looking at this kind of thing, along with the tremendous spending that this represents, said, Time out. We are not solving our problems.

I appreciate your time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I would say, when you look at this—I am just a country doctor from east Tennessee, but if you look at the health care problem in America, it is this: One is we have had escalating costs. There is no question of the costs. And we have got people who don't have health insurance coverage. Those are the two problems. How do you solve those problems?

Let me explain to you why having more government will never work and will end up costing more money. And my good friend from Pennsylvania, Congressman THOMPSON, has hit the nail right on the head.

When you take \$500 billion—and I have dealt with Medicare patients for my entire medical practice. When you take \$500 billion out of a plan that is already underfunded, that goes upside down in premiums by 2017—and beginning next year the baby boomers hit 3 million to 3.5 million new recipients every year. You take a half trillion dollars out and you add 30 to 35 million people, three things happen: One, you have decreased access; two, because you are not going to get in to see the doctor, number two, you are going to have decreased quality; and three, and seniors get this, their costs are going to go up to get the care that they need.

Mr. AKIN. Doctor, you are so eloquent and you said it so smoothly, but I just think we need to underline what you said.

What you are saying is you are going to take \$500 billion out of Medicare. Now, is this a Republican that is going to raid Medicare?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. No, sir.

Mr. AKIN. We have always been accused of raiding Medicare, but we are not the ones doing this, right?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That is correct. Unless you are in Florida, of course.

Mr. AKIN. So we are going to take \$500 billion out of Medicare. And what do you think is going to happen? If you take \$500 billion out of Medicare, it is going to be harder to provide services for people.

But you are not just doing that alone. You are adding more people and taking money out.

□ 1745

So now you're sort of compounding the problem. And so the result is you're going to get poorer quality care and you're going to have to pay more money on the side, I suppose. Is that right, Doctor?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That's correct. What you're going to do is, you're going to create waits. There's no other way around it. And that's my biggest fear as a physician, is that at the bottom line, the end of the day, when you budget so much money for health care and you have more demand for services than you have money to pay for it, you create waits. It happens in England, France, and Germany, unless you are wealthy and can buy your way around the system, which is what happens. But I'm talking about for the bulk of the American people.

Over 90 percent of the people who have insurance in this country like it. And they like what they have. They understand we pass all of this right here. When a patient comes to me, am I going to be able to provide better care for that patient? The answer is, No, I can't. And let's look at some numbers.

Mr. AKIN. One other point, Doctor. You said you're just a country doctor from Tennessee. But if I remember right, there were two States that did the experiment of essentially government-run health care. One was the great State of Massachusetts, which has now become my fond friend.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mine, too.

Mr. AKIN. And the second one is Tennessee. So you've had personal firsthand of the State government deciding they're going to take over health care. Is that correct?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. We had the 17-year experiment called TennCare. And to back up to the beginning of Medicare, in 1965 that great program that was passed started as a \$3 billion program. The congressional estimates were at that time that by 1990, 25 years later, it would be a \$15 billion program. The actual number, a \$90 billion program. It's gone from \$90 billion in 1990 to over a \$400 billion program. And we're going to cut this much money out. As our population ages, there's going to be more spending involved. Now that's one plan.

In Tennessee, we started with a managed care plan in 1993 to control costs, because costs were going up and there wasn't enough access for our citizens. It was a \$2.6 billion program in 1993. In 10 budget years it was an \$8 billion program. It took up almost every new dollar that the State of Tennessee brought. And let me go on and fast forward to this Senate bill for a moment, because this is very important for States.

This bill calls for a massive expansion, the Senate bill, a massive expansion of Medicaid. In the State of Tennessee we're looking at three-quarters of a billion dollars of unfunded—unfunded—liability. That's what Nebraska got off the hook for. What you're asking us to do in Tennessee is we, this year, Mr. Speaker, this year we have 50 less highway patrolmen in the State of Tennessee than we had in 1978. And we have 2 million more people. That's the kind of shape that the States are getting in. And we're getting now another unfunded mandate through this health care bill that I don't know where the money is going to come from.

We have no capital projects for our colleges this year in the State of Tennessee. We're not building a new dormitory, a new library, or anything. And yet we're going to get crammed down this massive expansion of government with an unfunded mandate. That's why people are angry.

Mr. AKIN. Doctor, you just made another point. What I'm hearing you say is that the estimate that the CBO has put together of this little treasure here of a trillion dollars, that part of the deal is it's a little more than a trillion, because we're going to do something that's going to make the States pay a chunk of change, too. So we have what's called an unfunded mandate that's going to descend on the States.

The trouble is the States don't have the option we do of just busting the budget, because a lot of them have balanced budget amendments. And that's going to be tough.

I'd like to go back over to Congressman THOMPSON from Pennsylvania. Would you like to join us here?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Absolutely. I believe, actually, it was the Tennessee Governor, a Democrat, who coined the term that this Senate bill and the Medicaid, the shoving of the increased Medicaid rolls and shifting that over to the State was, "the mother of all unfunded mandates."

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That's what he said.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Sounds like a very smart man.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. He is a very good Governor.

Mr. AKIN. That's a Democrat Governor.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. AKIN. He says it's the mother of all unfunded mandates. That says that trillion may be a pretty conservative number.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. When we look at the State of Pennsylvania, the conservative estimates are that the Senate bill provision with the huge expansion of the Medicaid rolls, which is truly just shifting it to the States without funding, \$2.4 billion to the State of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania went 6 months—at least 6 months without a budget this past year, the State government, because they couldn't make it balance. They're required to, but they just couldn't get it done. The economics, the revenue, and the expenses just did not match up.

I think that there are so many problems with the proposals that our Democratic colleagues have been proposing. And I suspect what we will see as a bill comes out of the closed, dark room to the House floor, that it will be very flawed. But let me just say there are solutions. There are solutions that have been defined. There are solutions that have been introduced going back to July of this year, 7 months ago, and there are solutions that have received even some support but are largely Republican solutions.

The Putting Patients First Act, which addresses the issue of tort reform and takes that \$329 billion—minimum of waste, and that would allow the cost of everybody's health care to come down. The Putting Patients First Act, which allows the bidding of health insurance across State lines, which allows the formation of association health plans to give small businesses the opportunity to join together to have a larger voice and more negotiation power. It also addresses key issues, and does it in a good market approach of addressing preexisting conditions.

They allow the States to create high-risk pools. Just because you're born with a preexisting condition or during

the course of your lifetime you experience or develop a disease or disability, say breast cancer or prostate cancer, that should not mean that you shouldn't be able to afford to purchase—I'm not saying anybody give you—but be able to afford to purchase reasonably priced health insurance.

The Republican solution does that. And it doesn't do it with massive taxing. Does it with no taxing, does it with no cuts to Medicare, does it with no shifting of tremendous health care cost to the State. It is a win-win and brings down the cost of health care for everybody.

Mr. AKIN. So we've got some solutions. I was just thinking about the voters in all the different States that are frustrated. They may be listening to us even here on the floor of the Congress, and they're thinking, Do they guys get it or not? Why are they talking about these huge Big Government solutions and spending the money that we don't have. I'm not sure some of them aren't ready to declare independence again.

I was just thinking, if you're going to write a declaration of independence relative to health care, one of the things you say is, it's not going to add a whole lot of money to the big national debt. That's one thing you've got to pay attention to. It's not going to impose mandates on States or employers or individuals. And it's not going to use taxpayer dollars to fund abortions or illegal immigrants.

I think those are all things that have been debated and discussed and people are upset about. It's going to be negotiated, I think, in a free and open format instead of behind closed doors. We're going to reserve that doctor-patient relationship. And we're going to allow freedom, which has worked so well in America for a couple of hundred years, to reign. To actually have some freedom to let people make choices and trust them to make their own choices and then do some of these common-sense solutions that you're talking about to not try to reproduce the failed systems of the Soviet Union or the failed systems of European medicine or Canadian medicine, which are very inefficient and expensive, but rather build on the model of freedom and people's free choices and people making distinctions between what sort of health care they do or don't want and, particularly, allowing doctors to practice medicine without feeling threatened from lawyers or insurance companies or Big Brother looking over their shoulder.

If you go to med school and spend a quarter of a million bucks on education, I think I'd rather have your opinion as to what you ought to do to me. I don't mean to rant here, but it seems like we need some sort of statement or declaration or something about some basic principles that Americans believe in.

I yield to you, Doctor ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I think one of the problems that you've seen with

this plan is the complexity of it. I think the bottom line, what you saw in Massachusetts yesterday is that the people there do appreciate their own personal freedom. They want their freedom to choose. Also, Massachusetts was being asked, since they've already been mandated to pay for their own policy, which I might add has added tremendous cost, and I will also tell you that half of the primary care doctors in that State are not accepting patients.

This is one of the things that isn't understood about a lot of the government-run plans: They don't pay the cost of the care. We haven't discussed that much here, but in our own State, Medicaid pays less than 60 percent of the cost to the providers; the hospitals and the doctors. Medicare pays somewhere between 80 and 90 percent of the costs. The rest of those costs are shifted to private health insurers, meaning that people out in private businesses are actually getting taxed again.

What Congressman THOMPSON was talking about, another thing that's left out of this particular plan that's really unfair is that you're not even putting in the so-called "doctor fix." Let me explain that to the viewing public out there. In 1997, there was a bill passed here called "The Sustainable Growth Rate: How Medicare Pays the Physicians." And what happened was, is there was supposed to be cuts every year. This year, there was supposed to be a 21 percent cut to physicians, which if that happens, nobody is going to be able to see a Medicare patient. And that's not even here. It's over a \$200 billion pricetag that's not even listed in this current trillion-dollar pricetag.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. So the statistic you talked about, Medicare payments, which it has been my experience in Pennsylvania, for every dollar of cost, reimbursement of 80 to 90 cents. So for every dollar of cost, the physicians are already losing significant moneys. That 21 percent cut that you talked about, that's on top of that.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That's correct. That's on top of the 80 to 90 percent. So for patients and what they're concerned with now, I believe what's happened, and just to simplify in my own terms, is what happened in Massachusetts, where people saw they were already paying very high taxes, they were already paying for coverage, and then they were going to have to pay for States like Nebraska, who were opted out of this deal.

Congressmen, I was very proud to be sworn in to the U.S. Congress on the 6th of January, 2009. I woke up on the 23rd—

Mr. AKIN. You didn't know what you were in for, did you? It's been a whale of a ride, brother.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. It has been a whale of a ride. I woke up on the 23rd

of December and told my wife that I was actually embarrassed to be in this House because of the deals that were cut. And who ultimately paid for them are the patients and taxpayers. And that's wrong. It really embarrassed me when you saw this deal in Louisiana and the different deal in Florida.

Mr. AKIN. We've just got about a minute or two. We're going to be followed up by another good friend of mine. We may stay on this topic a little bit. I thought it might be appropriate tonight in the last minute or two to make a tribute to Massachusetts. Now who would have thought Congressman AKIN would be making a tribute to Massachusetts? But if you recall our history, Massachusetts used to be the cradle of freedom and innovation in terms of government. It was Massachusetts in 1620 that saw the Pilgrims come. They put together the idea of the first concept of a Republic. A group of free people, under God, selecting their own leadership to preserve their God-given rights. That's a powerful idea that came from Massachusetts. A hundred-fifty years later you had the Massachusetts provincial Congress saying, Resistance to tyranny is your Christian duty.

For the last 50 or 100 years it seems like Massachusetts has been sending us the King's people, always wanting more taxes, more government, more government spending, bigger government, and yesterday the people of Massachusetts reverted back to that great heritage of patriotism and freedom and said, We're finally tired of Big Government. It's time we start to look at solving our problems without thinking every solution means more taxes and more Washington, D.C., control.

I thank you, gentlemen, that your States have stood for freedom and your constituents have elected you to join us here to stand up for just plain, old basic American principles. I think we're going to get the job done. I think that what happened yesterday was about, from a political point of view, quite a stroke of lightning. I think it should get people's attention. I think the public has spoken. And it's time for us to move on with the ideas that you, Doctor ROE, have been making very clear here. It's not like these things are too complicated. And G.T., same thing. You're from Pennsylvania, representing the people with common sense. These things are not complicated. Define the problem, craft a limited solution that fixes it instead of trying to scrap everything and go to the Big-Government-fixes-all kind of model. I think it's really something that the people of Massachusetts kind of came back to their heritage and to their roots in standing up for the country, as they did so many years ago.

□ 1800

When I was a little kid, I lived in Concord and Lexington—actually in Concord, and I saw the place where the Minutemen had stood against the big-

gest military power in the world. There is a statue that says: "By the rude bridge that arched the flood, their flag to April's breeze unfurled, here once the embattled farmers stood, and fired the shot heard round the world." They stood for freedom, and they stood for the basic principles that America has always stood on. And I am sure glad they joined us yesterday in making a statement and a statement that's going to affect this chart right here. Hopefully this chart goes in the dust bin before it ever becomes law. Last word, GT?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, I just couldn't agree more. I think yesterday was a statement that the American people—what they want and what they expect from our leadership is that we do our best to provide safety, prosperity and liberty, the freedoms within this country. And that's the type of public policy that they've been getting since last January. That has worked against all three of those.

Mr. AKIN. Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Health care should not be a partisan issue. In 30-plus years, I never saw a Republican or Democrat heart attack. I never operated on a Republican or Democrat cancer, just a people problem. We need to get together in this body and not have a partisan solution. There needs to be a bipartisan solution that is simple and addresses problems that we have laid out here today so that patients, their families and doctors can make health care decisions.

Mr. AKIN. And that's certainly what you've been talking about tonight, both of you gentlemen. I understand that my good friend Congressman KING is going to be here in just a jiff. He is going to be continuing along the same lines, talking about freedom, talking about the principles that made this country and how those principles can be applied to solving these very practical problems with health care.

I will check to see how we are doing on time. Oh, we actually have 2 minutes. So I don't want to cheat anybody. Are there any last comments? Anything that we haven't covered that you want to catch, Dr. ROE or GT?

Here is one. We didn't talk about all of the cool features of this policy; but this wheelchair tax, it was kind of stuck in my craw. The idea that you are going to tax a wheelchair, the mental picture of that just doesn't seem to be what we want to do. So we're looking for places to dig for money to pay for this Big Government system. So what are we going to do? We're going to pose a 2.5 percent excise tax on medical devices, which includes wheelchairs, to try to raise some money.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, my background is rehabilitation services. I have seen where these types of medical devices—and it is not just wheelchairs. That is an understatement. It is insulin. It is crutches. It is canes. It is prosthetic limbs. I mean, there are just

so many different things that this applies to. And this 2.5 percent excise tax, that is going to get passed right along to the consumers.

Most of the consumers who utilize these types of medical devices are older adults. They're individuals on very fixed incomes. Those who are surviving on maybe \$800 to \$1,200 a month of Social Security, and the very things that maximizes their independence, maximizes their quality of life, we're going to tax that? That's a quality-of-life tax, actually, because the people who use those medical devices, they are medically necessary. They're not luxuries. Those are devices that make their lives possible, that allow them to be able to live in the communities, to be able to live in their own homes, to not live in an institution. That's a quality-of-life tax.

Mr. AKIN. So if it moves, tax it. If it doesn't move, tax it anyway. It might be dead.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, gentlemen, for joining me.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

#### IMPACT OF MASSACHUSETTS ELECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate being recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. I have been listening to the dialogue that has been poured before us from the three gentlemen here, my colleagues, speaking mostly about health care, the National Health Care Act, and what this could mean.

I would like to pick this up from the place where TODD AKIN left off, and that would be the importance of the State of Massachusetts. I do not believe that it can be overstated, the impact of the election returns last night. I listened to Carl Cameron on FOX News who is, I believe, a very well-informed and probably a deeply researched individual. He said that this was the most important congressional race in 50 years. Well, I can remember that far back, and I would completely agree with him. And I would suspect it may be the most important congressional race in the history of our country, Mr. Speaker.

The situation in Massachusetts where TODD AKIN laid out the poem that said, "and fired the shot heard around the world," well, this in Massachusetts last night was a shot heard around the world. It was the SCOTT heard around the world. He will be here tomorrow, straight down that hallway,

swearing into the United States Senate.

So how did we get to this point, and what happened? And what is the significance of what took place in Massachusetts last night, Mr. Speaker? Those are the issues that I think are important to the American people here. I will make the point that we're a Nation that, let's say, we have people who are studying every day to be nationalized American citizens. We're a Nation that has skimmed the vigor off of every donor civilization that has sent immigrants to the United States.

The Mayflower landed at Plymouth Rock in 1620, 390 years ago. They disembarked from the Mayflower because they came over here for religious liberty, religious freedom. They established those freedoms and liberties right there in the Bay State. Now this Nation was founded on the same principles and the same liberty that came to us with the Pilgrims and were built upon as the years unfolded. And it's rooted back, a long ways back. A Western civilization itself, I would trace it back to the Greeks 3,000 years ago and the Age of Enlightenment, especially the English-speaking division of the Age of Enlightenment, which brought us free enterprise.

And if there is an immigrant in the United States who is studying to take the test to become a naturalized American citizen, there is a whole stack of flashcards that are there that are put out by the United States Citizenship Immigration Services. They are glossy flashcards. The government spent a lot of money to make these things real nice. You look on one side, and it will say, Who is the founder of our country? You flip it over to the other side, George Washington. Who saved the Union? Flip it over, Abraham Lincoln. Who signed the Emancipation Proclamation? Same man. Next question, What is the economic system of the United States of America?

You flip the card over, and if you are going to pass the test to become an American citizen, you have to answer what it says on the back of that card, free enterprise capitalism, Mr. Speaker. The economic system where we don't have the government setting prices. We have the market setting prices. We have supply and demand setting prices, and we let people invest equity, sweat equity and capital to buy, sell, trade, make, gain, invent. We protect the intellectual property through patents and trademarks, and we also encourage people to make money. We know that when you generate that wealth in the legitimate private sector that everyone prospers, that a rising tide does lift all boats.

And that's what people were thinking, I believe, in Massachusetts yesterday. I spent 3 days there. They were an outstanding 3 days. It was a fantastic experience. I went to polling places. I went to campaign headquarters, both sides of the case. I went to union halls, and I talked to as many people across

the State of Massachusetts as I possibly could. The center line was this: the Federal Government spent too much money. It's gotten too big. It's gotten too intrusive. They're imposing too many mandates and regulations on the American people. They have their own universal health care in Massachusetts, and they aren't particularly happy with it.

One of the things they have a conscience about is not imposing that version on the entire United States of America. They understood that for them to cast a vote wasn't just, How did their ballot for SCOTT BROWN, how did it affect the destiny of Massachusetts? It wasn't a selfish vote. They understood they have a national responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

It was a national responsibility, and I understand this, I think, as well as most in the country because Iowa is first in the Nation caucus, and we take our jobs seriously, and we're all politics all the time. Generally, every 4 years we very, very often have at least one Presidential candidate from Massachusetts that we host. They go around through Iowa, sit down, have coffee with us and we talk to them. We look them eye to eye. I have done that more than once. We take our retail politics seriously.

But when we go to the first-in-the-Nation Presidential caucus and cast our ballot there, even though it has more impact than probably the single vote of anyone from any other State with regard to who is nominated as the President, Mr. Speaker, it is still only a recommendation to the rest of the country. Iowa gets to go first. We take it seriously. Somebody has to be first. I don't have confidence in anybody else to do a better job. But it's still only a recommendation.

What happened in Massachusetts last night was not a recommendation that affected the rest of the country like Iowa makes when they do the first-of-the-Nation Presidential caucus. What happened in Massachusetts last night was a decision for the rest of the country, a decision that will bind the destiny of America. They understood that, and they stepped up to that cause, and their conscience and their sense of responsibility kicked in.

So I am very proud of what the citizens of Massachusetts have done. They have mobilized the political effort that many of them hadn't seen ever in their lifetimes. I talked to a lady that said that she has worked in political campaigns for 50 years, 50 years; and she said that when the polls closed, and they counted the ballots, they cried their eyes out, and then they got up, and they went to work again. Well, this time I imagine there were tears among these groups. They probably did cry their eyes out, but they were tears of joy. And a great shout of joy went up all across America that finally, finally somebody heard.

I have asked for reinforcements. I have prayed for the cavalry to come,

and at the last minute they came riding over the hill in the person of SCOTT BROWN. Now we have a chance to save, serve and protect our liberty; and this debate now begins on an entirely different field, on an entirely different terrain, and I believe an entirely different outcome. I am completely in awe at how the most improbable sometimes comes along to save us with something that appeared to be inevitable.

The gentleman from Tennessee has been willing to stick around, and I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee who happens to be a doctor, who knows what TennCare looks like and knows what America would look like if we adopted TennCare, CanadaCare, United KingdomCare, GermanCare, name your country. But this is America, and take care to protect America. The gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I think last night, watching what happened in Massachusetts, was really, in the many years I have watched politics, was really astounding. The people there I think—it was more than just health care. We have a country now that's not in trouble. We're America, and we know how to avoid trouble in this country. But we have a lot of our citizens who are hurting now. They need jobs, and they need employment. Certainly in our district and around our area where unemployment is over 10 percent, that's the talk in the barber shops and the restaurants: What's the economy doing? What business are we going to lose overseas next? What manufacturing job is going to be gone?

I think the people there looked at more than just health care. I think they looked at a stimulus package of almost \$800 billion that I don't believe has worked. It certainly has provided some one-time jobs. But you know and I know as a former mayor that you don't take one-time money and turn that into a long-time job.

How you do that is you incentivize the people who are creating jobs in this country. That is small business. In this country, 70 percent of the businesses are small business that create the jobs. And how do you help them? You make the cost of capital, the cost of money, the cost of creating a job less. How do you do that? Well, you cut capital gains taxes. You can cut individual income tax rates. You can accelerate depreciation for plant equipment that they buy. So we have a country now that has put itself in debt that my great grandchildren will not be able to pay off.

□ 1815

We looked last year, and it is staggering to me how much a trillion dollars is. I get almost overwhelmed, and I made it through calculus in college, and I have a tough time getting my arms around how much money that really is.



We have a budget that went up 8 percent last year. We added 8 percent. In the State of Tennessee where I live, we had to live on less money than the year before. That is what we had to do in our State. That is what California is having to do. That is what every State in this Union is having to do.

I don't know if the people here in Washington get out, as I have, and talk to our Governors and our State legislators, but our States are in trouble. We need our economy to pick up. If our economy was doing well, I don't think that our health care issue would be as big of an issue as it is. As people lose their jobs, they lose their health benefits.

The people of Massachusetts got their arms around the bigger problem, and I think they looked at this entire country and the direction it is going and said, Whoa, wait a minute, we don't like the direction that the country is going. They put the brakes on this. They said let's stop and take a slow, measured look at what we are doing.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. He mentioned that he has taken calculus. I mentioned that they put me through calculus, too, a couple of years, and they actually never told me at the beginning, middle, or end that there wasn't much purpose of going through all of those calculations. It was more about how to discipline the mind to think rationally, logically, and reasonably. That is also why they send people to law school. Our President went to law school and actually taught in law school. He taught constitutional law, which is a bit of a surprise to me that he can advocate some of the things that he does.

The basic logic that comes isn't rooted in law school and it isn't rooted necessarily in calculus. It isn't rooted in geometry or algebra. It might be two plus two equals four. But the rationale that was presented to us consistently and repeatedly by Presidential candidate, President-elect, and then President Obama, Mr. Speaker, was health care costs too much money. I have been browbeaten by the Europeans. They would say we spend 9.5 percent of our GDP. You spend 14.5 percent of your GDP. That is way too much money. Well, never mind, we make more money than they do. And never mind, we have better health care than they do. Never mind that we are willing to spend that. We don't like to spend it when we are looking at it in large, but when it comes time to save our lives or our health, we are glad to spend that kind of money.

We don't know what the threshold is, but our GDP, about 14½ percent spending, some say as high as 16 percent, we spend too much money; so, therefore, we should solve the problem by what? This is this two plus two. What the President proposed to us didn't spend less money. Anybody in third grade, if you say you have a problem with

spending too much money, what do you do about that, you could hand them a 50-cent allowance, and you spend a quarter, not all 50 cents, and a kid can understand that at age 6 or 7, maybe even less than that.

But we are here listening to, being browbeaten and demagogued because we have a health care policy that spends too much money. It is 9.5 percent in the rest of the industrialized world and 14.5 percent here in the United States. So what does the President propose to do about solving spending too much money? Spend more. Spend at least a trillion more.

If you look at the real costs involved, look at Judd Gregg's numbers, the first real 10 years, it is \$2.5 trillion more. If you look at the contingent liabilities that go along with this and all of the other components, it may be as high as \$6 trillion more. So the problem of spending too much money is solved supposedly in a rational fashion and advocated by the President, the Speaker of the House, the majority leader of the United States Senate, and all of the people that line up to vote for their bills, solve the problem of spending too much money by spending a lot more money.

Now we have kind of forgotten about all of the browbeating that went on about we need more competition in health care insurance. The President made that argument over and over again. Well, he has the bully pulpit, but, you know, they have yet to invent the saw that will cut off the branch of truth. We can go out and stand on the branch of truth and we can say, All right, how many insurance companies do you need in America, Mr. President, to have the extra competition? Funny, a guy that doesn't much believe in the free market system thinks we ought to inject competition into the health insurance industry. So the President wants one more health insurance company in America and then that is going to fix the problems.

So I ask a simple question: How many companies are there in America? The answer comes back, 1,300; 1,300 health insurance companies, Mr. Speaker. And that is a little bit of a round number. So if you have all of these companies that are competing, 1,300 of them—I have never had that much competition, and I made my living on low bid in the construction business. When I had seven or eight or nine people bidding against me, I already knew somebody was going to make a mistake on the bid and lose money and take the chance for profit away from the rest of us.

So if there are 1,300 companies and they are competing, throwing one more in there doesn't really help that mix. But it wasn't the President's idea to provide more competition anyway; he just thought we would believe that. His idea was to get government in the business of providing that which the people in the private sector could do very well themselves.

And, by the way, these 1,300 companies offer a different variety of policies that individuals could shop and buy, approximately 100,000 different policy varieties, Mr. Speaker. So you can multiply 100,000 policies out there and you can look at 1,300 companies that are brokering them, and imagine how is it the Federal Government getting into the business could legitimately compete with those kinds of entities.

And if you want more competition, the way you provide that is open up the trade from State to State so people can buy health insurance in Tennessee instead of New Jersey. The gentleman from Tennessee knows what that is like. That would make sure that all 1,300 companies competed against each other, and these 100,000 policy varieties would probably get to be less because they wouldn't have to accommodate some of the silly mandates that come down from the States.

So a young man buying health insurance in New Jersey, a healthy 25-year-old might pay \$6,000 a year for a typical policy. Or he could go to Kentucky where there are fewer mandates, and a similar but not identical policy might cost that same individual \$1,000. Now, what kind of a smart, young person usually on a limited budget would write a check for \$6,000 if they could write a check for \$1,000. Wouldn't we then have more people insured if they had more options? That's the answer.

Furthermore, there are things we want to fix. We want to fix lawsuit abuse. The health insurance underwriters produced a number. The one that I trust the most—and I have seen numbers on the cost of lawsuit abuse in America on health care to go as low as 5.5 percent of the overall cost of health care services provided. I have seen it go as high as over 30 percent. The number that I trust is 8.5 percent. So 8.5 percent of the cost of health care in America is \$203 billion a year, and this is included in the additional tests that have to be given because they are done for defensive medicine purposes. Also, the litigation and settlements that don't have a medical reason for them. We want people to be whole. If they have suffered from malpractice, the legitimate system is there, but the abuse has taken this way out of sight. So \$203 billion a year going almost all of it to the trial lawyers, not to the patients but the trial lawyers.

And do you think there is a single Democrat in the House of Representatives or a single Democrat in the Senate who would stand up and say this is completely and totally utterly wrong to be funding trial lawyers on the backs of health care patients and acting like we are reforming health care and protecting the trial lawyers completely, not allowing insurance to be sold across State lines, and denying full deductibility for everybody's health insurance premiums?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. If the gentleman would yield, let me give a practical example of what you are saying there.

Let's say years ago if I were working in the emergency room and a patient came in with right-sided pain, I might be concerned about whether they had an appendicitis. I would get a blood count. It was at that time probably a \$15, \$20 test. It is probably a \$50 test now. You do a physical examination, take their vital signs, their blood pressure, their pulse and temperature and do a physical exam, and you would say, I don't think there is a chance that you have an appendicitis, but let's let you go home and if you get worse, start to have more pain, come right back and we will reevaluate you.

That is not going to happen anymore because part of the legal system now, you know if you do that and you don't get a CT scan, a very expensive test on that patient and you go out and you happen to have an appendicitis, the one in 500 times that might happen, you will be held liable. So all 499 people are going to come out of the emergency room glowing in the dark, just about, because of all the X-rays that they have had to protect the doctor from a potential lawsuit of the one in 500. That is the problem that you get into with the tests that are not needed basically to protect the physician. And why wouldn't the doctor order those tests? You don't want to put up everything you have earned in your entire life for the risk of that one in a thousand, that jackpot that somebody might have.

The thing you also brought up is people are genuinely injured in the system. We don't have any way to adequately compensate the injured parties without the attorneys getting their hands on a significant amount of the settlements.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I had a conversation with an orthopedic surgeon a couple of months ago. He said to me, I have a small practice. He said 95 percent of the MRIs that he orders are completely unnecessary except he has to cover everything because someone might try to hit the jackpot. So he has to order those tests. Everybody in the business orders all of those tests.

If you cut out that 95 percent, his number is that it costs patient's insurance companies, taxpayers, a million dollars a year just to fund the unnecessary tests in one that he calls a small practice. That gives you an implication. You can multiply that \$1 million across the whole country, and what you come up with is \$203 billion in additional costs. We can't get them all out of there. There is a bill that we have introduced that finds about \$54 billion over 10 years. I think it ought to be tougher than that. I think we ought to tighten this thing down more.

The argument again that has been made out of the White House and out of the majority party and from the Speaker's office itself, too, is that Republicans don't have any solutions. Well, they must have sat up some night in one of those formerly smoke-filled rooms to come up with an idea like

that. It is completely and utterly false, Mr. Speaker. Republicans have introduced at least 42 separate bills in this 111th Congress that reform health care. And I can tell you exactly how many of them were incorporated into this document that was promised to be a bipartisan document, and that is a complete double aught goose egg. None. No free market solutions, no patient choice solutions, no medical malpractice lawsuit abuse reform, no selling insurance across State lines, no full deductibility, no real transparency, none of the components that give people options and choices have been considered.

And why? Because if you put free market solutions in and you give people the liberty and the freedom to make their own decisions on health care, first, they are going to take a financial responsibility and a personal responsibility. If you help out on the lawsuit abuse, more people are going to say, I don't need that test either, Doctor, and so let's save the money and not do that. But the bottom line is Republicans have always injected free market solutions in place; for example, health savings accounts.

Health saving accounts are just starting to grow the way they need to. That is 2003 legislation, wiped out by this proposal that comes from Speaker PELOSI, the President, and HARRY REID. No more health savings accounts if you read the legislation and figure out how it is going to come out. Imagine this, Mr. Speaker. If a young couple had engaged in health savings accounts when it was first set up by this Congress in 2003 and they invested \$5,150 as the maximum amount into their health savings account, and if they spent \$2,000 a year out of that health savings account in legitimate expenses and accrued the balance of that account at 4 percent per annum and compounded it, they would reach retirement age, the two of them in reasonably good health with \$950,000 in their health savings account.

And what is the interest that CHARLIE RANGEL has on that: Tax it. They want to tax it. I want to give an incentive to buy a Medicare replacement policy and let them keep the change. That Medicare replacement policy would cost about \$72,000 per person today. That is one of the Republican solutions, but it doesn't fit very well with socialized medicine, you know. That is what happens.

This is an effort to try to mix. They didn't try to mix, but the reason it doesn't mix is because it is oil and water. It is freedom and liberty. It is market solutions and individual responsibility and doctor-patient relationships on this side, and over on this side it is socialized medicine, one size fits all. Big Brother at the top draconianly mashes this down on everybody else in America, and you have to accept the policy that they give you and you have to then get in line.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. If the gentleman would yield, let's just talk

about, for a minute, we have this very complex, over 2,000-page bill which I have read. The Senate bill is over 2,500 pages, which I will admit I have not read. I have seen the synopsis of it. We have 118 new agencies in this very complex schematic that you have down there in front of you. We should, on both sides of the aisle, be able to agree on a few things. One is that we agree that the cost of care is rising too fast and we have the uninsured out there that we need to cover. Those are the two basic premises that spurred this entire debate. How can you best solve those problems? It is not that complicated. You can do several things.

One, as you point out, let's just look at five things that we can do on 25 pages, not a complicated 2,000 pages. You can let people buy insurance just like you do your auto insurance or your life insurance. We see advertisements every night on television with a little gecko running around, those cute ads they have. Let people buy health insurance across State lines.

Let young people who don't have health insurance stay on their parents' plan, if they don't have a job that provides it, until they are 26 or 27 years old. Pick your number. You can cover 7 million people by doing that at zero cost to the Federal Government.

You pointed out very eloquently liability reform. You save billions of dollars doing that.

You simply sign up the people right now who are eligible for government programs without creating another new one. You cover 19 million people by doing that. You are not creating another agency and 118 new bureaucracies.

Expand the health savings account. I will give you personal experience. I have had one for 2 years. I put \$5,000 a year in. Instead of the insurance company keeping my \$10,000, I have spent about \$2,000. My wife and I are both healthy, fortunately. We have \$8,000 in our health savings account that we can use how we choose, not the insurance company.

□ 1830

I think for someone who owned an individual policy, you can treat them like a big corporation. Let them deduct their premiums just like General Motors gets to do, like the big unions do, and so forth.

And then I think the last thing you have to do is you have to put some individual responsibility for each of us, so that everybody, no matter what care they get, needs to pay something for the care. It shouldn't be totally free. We saw that in Tennessee, when our costs just skyrocketed because of the very generous plan we had there where there were no costs to the patients and it was overutilized.

So those are five or six things that every one of us in this room, in this auditorium, ought to be able to agree on and take care of. And it wouldn't be hard to do. It is an easy solution. We

should be able to pass that in no time at all. And the President ought to listen to that. He really should. These are simple, real-world solutions.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. They are simple, real-world solutions. They are free market solutions. They are common-sense solutions. And there is this other part about human nature. It is helpful when a country has its leaders that believe in the principles that built this as a great Nation, and also understand the human nature part.

There has to be incentives in place. And a nanny state can never be enough of a nanny to take care of people's failings. I think it was Phil Gramm that said this first, that I heard it anyway, and that is you take the safety net out there, that safety net that taught a man to fish, and then you give him the fish instead, and you turn the safety net into a hammock.

So here is the safety net down here, and as Congress keeps cranking that safety net up higher and higher and higher, and it becomes more and more of a cushy hammock. And you know, there is a reason why the most successful civilizations in the world generally originated someplace in a temperate climate instead of down by the equator. Because there wasn't an incentive. You didn't have to prepare for winter.

Where I live, you by golly got to be ready for winter, which means in that window of time that we have from around the first of April until about the first of December you got to get all the things done you are going to get done outside. That means all the food has got to be put up. That means all the staples have to be put in place to get your work done. We got to get our construction work done then, because in the wintertime it gets cold and it gets dark soon. That means you have industrious people.

Now, I am not drawing a comparison between the Mason-Dixon line. I am drawing a comparison between the equator. And I want to make that point clear for my colleagues here. But the industriousness of people, that was necessary. Squirrels put away for the winter, grasshoppers freeze to death. And if you give people the hammock instead of the safety net, they are not going to take care of themselves, and more than likely they are going to have to require us to do that because we are not allowing them to be tested.

There is a value to adversity. When I think of the things that I have gone through, and I don't wish them upon anybody, the challenges that are there, but every one of them put a little more steel in me, a little more mettle in me, and caused me to be better organized, work harder, be more industrious, prepare more. And if you take away that reward for planning for your future, you will have people that don't plan for their future.

If you pay young women to have babies if there is not a man in the house, they will have babies. If you pay them

as long as they don't go to work, they won't go to work. These are simple things that anybody can understand that seem to have completely escaped the President of the United States and the majority party and the troika of leadership we have in this country called Obama, PELOSI, and REID.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. If the gentleman would yield for just a second, there is a great book out by Milton Friedman, *Free to Choose*. And he makes a statement in that book, if you want more of something, you subsidize it. If you want less, you tax it. And it is a very simple principle you can apply to health care or anything else. If you have government programs that are subsidized by the taxpayers, you will create more people who use those programs. We have seen it over and over and over again.

I will give you a brief example before I yield to my colleague from Georgia. In this country we talk about, and I heard many times about how—and we do have failings in our health care system. It is not perfect. But when President Clinton had a heart attack, he was taken to an emergency room to the hospital, where he had a heart cath and discovered that he had blockages in his arteries and needed a bypass operation for it to save his heart. He got a bypass operation. It was delayed a couple, 3 days I am sure because of a blood thinner they gave him. I don't know that, but I am pretty sure that is what happened or they would have done it immediately.

Let's say you are in small town Johnson City, Tennessee, and you don't have any insurance or anything at all, and you have a heart attack and you come to the emergency room, what is going to happen to you is you are going to get a heart cath and you are going to get a bypass operation, and then we will figure out how to pay for it.

In Canada if you have that heart attack, what they will tell you is there is a list that you get on that you can get a catheterization, where they put the dye in your heart and see if you have a blockage. You will get on a list. And when your name comes up, you will get the cath. And then you will get put on the list to see if you get a bypass operation. That is the difference and the delay in the care. And I have seen it happen. I know people that that has happened to in Canada.

They have wonderful physicians in Canada, I want to point out also. I know many of them, have worked with some that have moved to our community. Well trained, excellent doctors. So when you get the care, I think, in Canada, it is good care. I really believe that. When it is available, I think it is excellent care because of the experience I have had with Canadian-trained physicians. Some of my colleagues I worked with every day were well-trained physicians.

That is the rationing of care that we speak of that we don't want to have happen in our country. And we have

enough of that as it is. People will tell you that insurance companies ration care. And they do. And I think certainly they are to be held culpable also.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. And I just relate a very quick story that was presented to us by Dr. David Janda, who has written a book. He is out of Michigan. He has practiced in Canada. When he first went up there to work in the emergency room, and he is an orthopedic surgeon now, he had a patient come in, a young man who had torn up his knee playing softball, torn meniscus, ACL, I think, one of the ligaments. And he looked at him and he said you need surgery. I can schedule you in the morning. And he is in a Canadian emergency room. Must have been his first day at work. He found out that he couldn't schedule this young man for surgery the next morning. He couldn't even schedule him for a review to get the surgery approved under the Canadian health care plan.

So he had to back up and put him on crutches. And 6 months later this young man was allowed to be examined by the doctor who approves the request for surgery, and 6 months later they actually did the surgery. Almost 1 year to the day, the surgery took place in Canada that would have taken place the very next morning in the United States. Meanwhile, this young man can't go to work, his leg atrophies, he is running around on crutches. His life has been altered because different things happen in your life in that fashion. He didn't get back in the groove. What does that cost when you let people come out? That is an example.

And I know that we have experts here tonight. And so watching that clock tick, I am very interested to hear what the gentleman from Georgia has to say, whether it be about the Hawkeyes, the Yellow Jackets, or his field of expertise.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I think that I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding. And I am not going to say one word about the Hawkeyes and the Yellow Jackets. Maybe we will come back to that another year. But congratulations, by the way, to the Hawkeyes. They did a great job.

Mr. Speaker, it is an opportunity to come before our colleagues tonight and to join with Representative KING from Iowa and Representative ROE, Dr. ROE from Tennessee, and later on you will hear from MICHELLE BACHMANN, Representative BACHMANN from Minnesota, talking about the health care bill and health care reform in general.

I think we would be remiss if we didn't talk about the election yesterday in the Bay State, Massachusetts. Many of my colleagues have already spoken about that. And there is a lot of political pundits on every channel, cable, broadcast, network, whatever, trying to analyze and say, well, what happened? How did this occur? And, you know, we all have our own opinion,

but quite honestly, I think it is a lot about health care.

It was kind of instructive that when people were asked, coming out of a voting booth, what they thought about the health care reform bill in the Bay State that the same percentage that were opposed to it is the percentage that Senator-elect SCOTT BROWN received in the election. It was the same margin. So clearly, health care was a significant issue in that race in my opinion.

I think the people in Massachusetts clearly had about a year-and-a-half, 2 years to look at the commonwealth care that was enacted. And they don't like it, Mr. Speaker. They don't like it because it, instead of lowering the cost of health care, it has driven it up. Although more people are insured and have coverage in the Bay State, they are, as my colleagues have talked about in regard to other systems, there is a long queue, there is a long wait. It is very difficult to get a physician to see you, particularly if you are one of those who has a subsidized policy.

And basically, the state is going broke. And they have had to make a number of changes. They have had to drop dental care as part of the coverage. They have had to drop many thousands of legal immigrants who were not citizens, but had coverage. They no longer have coverage. And I know my colleague especially, Mr. Speaker, Dr. ROE from Tennessee has probably already talked about TennCare and their experiment 10, 12, 15 years ago, and the miserable failure of that.

So yes indeed, health care had a lot to do with the outcome yesterday in Massachusetts. But it was not just health care. I think that people are so tired, Mr. Speaker, of this Federal Government ignoring them and dissing them, as the expression goes. We had the August recess that lasted 5 weeks, and all of these town hall meetings all across the country, and we come back, and you would think that the majority party and the administration would have listened to those people. And instead, what they did is they simply changed the number on the House bill. They took off H.R. 3200, because the people had rallied against it so loudly over that 5-week period of time, instead they just changed the number on the bill.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I gladly yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. You can call a polecat a skunk, but it is still a polecat or a skunk, whatever you name it. I yield back.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Absolutely, the gentleman is right. And so people are sick and tired of being disrespected. They were very disappointed of course in the economic stimulus package, \$787 billion that was supposed to keep the unemployment rate at 8 percent, no higher than 8 per-

cent. It is 10.2 percent now. 16 million Americans out of work, many of them in the Bay State.

I think it is a message. It is a message to the administration, to President Obama, and the Democratic majority, Speaker PELOSI, Leader HARRY REID in the Senate. Look, you still have an opportunity, my colleagues, you still have an opportunity to come together in a bipartisan way and do things in an incremental fashion that truly will lower the cost of health insurance for everybody and make it better and rein in, yes, the abuses of the health insurance industry as well.

And what is this big rush, anyway? The Democratic majority, Mr. Speaker, insisted on getting it done in 2009. They didn't want to face this during an election year. Well, look, the American people are saying to us, and especially to the majority and to the President, We don't care about the next election. Get it right. Don't rush to judgment. What is the big hurry? Why not get it done in 2011 if it takes that long? But get it done right.

The people of Massachusetts went to the polls, they knew that their bill was an abject failure, and that is basically what they were saying. If the administration and this majority ignores it, they do it at their own peril.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Iowa, because I know there are others that want to speak tonight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And reclaiming before I yield, I want to pose a question here for consideration. Canadian health care plan, the average length of time to wait for a knee replacement is 340 days, a hip replacement 196 days. Where I come from, we don't stand in line. I went to Moscow a while back, and I watched people hunched over in their shoulders with their big coats and hats walking around looking for a line to stand in. And then when they got to the end of the line, then they went and looked for another line to stand in. I think a lot of times they didn't even know why they were even standing in line.

And it occurred to me, and it may not be universally true, but it occurred to me that free people don't stand in line. And if you are standing in line at Kentucky Fried Chicken, that means that somebody ought to have a free market opportunity to set something up next door. And people will go over there and get their service. But that is what the free market principle does. People don't stand in line when it is a free market principle. I would submit also that people die in line.

I yield to the gentlelady from Minnesota.

□ 1845

Mr. KING of Iowa. The gentlelady from Minnesota.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

I also have so much esteem for my colleague from Tennessee, Dr. ROE, and

also my colleague from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY. They are just wonderful examples, and they enlighten all of us who aren't medical professionals. But they've been there, done that. They have skin in the game, and they know what's at stake. They know what's at stake for those who have put so much into becoming physicians, who have put their life on the line to be healers, but also the people they serve. They see the real cost in human health, in terms of misery that is down the road if we embrace this system.

I come at it a little bit differently. My background is that I am a former Federal tax lawyer, and I see how egregious tax costs can destroy businesses, destroy families, individuals, farms and creativity. And also as a business owner. My husband and I have started two businesses. We're not a big deal; we've employed 50 people, but we do know what it is to take and start a business from scratch using our own equity, our own capital. We have to be disciplined and make a lot of good decisions. We have to get it right every time so that we can make a profit.

My husband told me that he spoke to a number of other small businessmen that have said to him they will have to cut jobs with their small businesses if this health care bill goes through. There are a lot of small business employers that would love to provide health insurance, but they can't because currently health insurance is so expensive.

I think one thing that cannot escape this discussion that we're having tonight among colleagues, whether we're health care professionals or tax lawyers or small business owners, is this; President Obama's Chief Economic Advisor, Christina Romer, said herself that if President Obama's plan would go into effect, that America would see 5.5 million jobs lost if we adopt his plan. Not only would it cost us trillions of dollars that we simply don't have, but it would cost us 5.5 million American jobs. It isn't that those jobs wouldn't be done, but they wouldn't be done in America. It's another 5.5 million jobs that would go offshore.

I yield to the gentleman from Tyler, Texas, LOU GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. So what you're saying is the President's health care bill really is a jobs bill, but instead of creating them, it eliminates them.

Mrs. BACHMANN. It eliminates them, and I think one can understand why. We saw a chart or a graph that was recently produced several weeks ago. It plotted all of the private-sector experience in the Presidents from the last 100 years. It showed that in President Obama's Cabinet, in his administration he has less private-sector experience in real job creation than any other administration: 7 percent experience. No wonder every answer that comes out of this administration is more spending, higher taxes, more government. But the last seven economic recessions, every blooming one of them

we have come out of the recession—from government? No. From small business creation.

We would love, in our small business, to create more jobs, but I will tell you this, from the other small business job creators that I know in Minnesota: Right now they are scared to death. They don't want to add more jobs because they know if they add more jobs, they're stuck with more costs that they may not be able to take. They don't want to hurt the existing people they have now that they hired. They don't want to have to close their doors and fold up. A great business in our State, Home Value stores, just announced last week that they were closing their doors after over 35 years in business. Why? Because of this job-killing, bone-crushing debt that's coming out of Washington, D.C. Let's reject that.

The American people last night rejected President Obama's decision because if there is one headline that would encapsulate all of 2009 it would have to be this: "The Federal Government takeover of private industry." That's what last year was all about. The American people said no way; we believe in America, we believe in job creation, we believe in prosperity. And that's what last night's poll numbers reflected.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I would propose that it actually goes another step yet, and that is, we talked about the government takeover of the private sector, and we talked about between 30 percent and 33 percent of the private-sector profits nationalized by mostly this President's administration. We've seen the nationalization take place, the government takeover, but the most personal and private property we have is our own bodies. This is a government nationalization, a government takeover of our individual persons and bodies, managing our health care and seeking to tell us what we can eat and what we can't, what we can drink and what we can't, managing our own personal bodies. What could be a more egregious violation of liberty and freedom than that?

I would like to pose a question for a response here and maybe go down through some things in my mind and see if there is dissent among the esteemed Members of Congress that are here on the floor.

First I would ask you, if they impose a centrally controlled system of government-run health care, will it result in a loss of personal and economic liberties? And is it an indisputable violation of the principle of limited government established by the Constitution? Would you agree with that?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Absolutely. Yes, I would. I would agree with that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I will ask another question. If they impose a government-run health care system, would such system result in increased costs in taxes to individuals, to families, to

businesses, as well as to all taxpayers at the Federal, State and local levels?

Mrs. BACHMANN. It would. And that's what I am so worried about as a tax lawyer, that this will mean diminished opportunities for Americans because we will see increased taxes in defiance of President Obama's promise to the American people.

Mr. KING of Iowa. What kind of harm would that do to the American economy and the businesses and jobs and productivity and quality of life?

Mrs. BACHMANN. It would be irreparable harm. It would be very difficult to come back from.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I will yield.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. What the gentlelady from Minnesota has said is absolutely true. Just in our area, at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee, the largest employer in the county, 14,000 people—these are jobs that don't go overseas, they're not exported, these people are doing great work—new innovations, new treatments that may go away with this system—they're afraid to hire anybody. In my local town, our medical center, 9,000 employees in their system. The adjoining city has a medical system of 6,000. That's 15,000 people that work in health care in two cities with a little over 100,000 combined population bringing quality care to the people of Appalachia.

What I am worried about is if that's going to go away. Those jobs will dry up—and those are great jobs that are not exported anywhere, they are jobs for Americans with health insurance, with retirement plans, great benefits, and we may be tanking that also.

I want to just reminisce for a moment when I graduated from medical school and think back as the gentlelady from Minnesota, Congresswoman BACHMANN, was talking about. When I graduated from medical school there were five high blood pressure medications, three of them made you sicker than the high blood pressure did. Now we have over 50 wonderful medications to provide for people. Antibiotics, a plethora of antibiotics; we had one or two at the time I graduated. Ultrasounds, MRIs, PET scans, survival rates of cancer. The research is just astonishing that's going on in America. We are the leader in the world; the world looks to us for medical innovation. With this right here I'm afraid it will stymie that innovation.

I think back—and we were talking about this a moment ago—one of my good friends and a colleague, a medical colleague whose wife is English, his sister-in-law lived in England. She died of chronic lymphocytic leukemia. That's a disease that Americans just don't die of any longer. We live with that disease. It's treatable. She was treated with a blood transfusion. We could have done that 50 years ago. That's all the treatment. And she got that treat-

ment because she was too old to be treated. We don't do that in this country. And I'm afraid we're heading down that path.

I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, the value of life changes.

And another point, a point that I think JOHN SHADEGG made very well, is that this policy here—whatever number they attach to it or whatever they might try to do—will have mandates in it. And what it will do is it will require certain health insurance policies to have those mandates covered in there, and it mandates that people buy them or employers provide them. And his case is that that's a tax. I would ask the man who is the judge if he could explain why it's a tax when the government makes someone buy a policy and then takes it out of their taxes if they don't and puts them in debtors prison if they hold back. If you have to buy something, why does that make it a tax?

Mr. GOHMERT. If it's mandated by the government, then certainly it's a tax, because that is all that the government is entitled to do. Under our Constitution, you can't force somebody to buy a product.

And I appreciate your directing that question to me because obviously all the prior questions were directed at my friends from Louisiana and Minnesota because you qualified it by saying, This question is for the esteemed Members. So I stayed quiet throughout your answers, but now you have included me as the unesteemed Member.

Mr. KING of Iowa. They're polar opposites, Mr. GOHMERT; they're Tennessee and Minnesota.

Mr. GOHMERT. Yes, exactly, Tennessee. Tennessee and Minnesota.

But that is what has gotten people upset across the country and is what we saw in Massachusetts. They've seen what's going on around here.

There was a promise that C-SPAN would be covering all the negotiations because we're talking about people's lives, the length of their lives, and their loved ones, how long are they going to be able to be living in this world, whether they will get the medication they need, or are they going to be told you're too old? So as the President so ably said before he was elected, those negotiations need to be out there. And all we've seen is the nasty, sordid deals that were cut after being behind closed doors so that you have insurance companies signing onto the President's bill. And then you go through and say, ah, here are the pages where they got their deal cut. Ah, here is the deal that the plaintiffs lawyers got. Ah, here's the deal the pharmaceutical industry got. And they're conflicting. And it is such a mass of mess the way they've cut these deals and they've forged them together. And the ones that are going to suffer are the people in this country when there is no reason to.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Should they be negotiated publicly and free of political favoritism, Mr. GOHMERT?

Mr. GOHMERT. Exactly.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If I could just respond on the tax portion. Government can directly mandate that you must pay a percentage or a fee, which is a direct tax. But if government requires you to do something or purchase a health insurance policy in conformity with what government says must be the items in that policy, that's just as much a tax as if government says you must pay a percent or an exact amount. The final result is the same because the taxpayers' pockets are picked for what government mandates it must be picked for. It is a tax, pure and simple. That's the point.

Mr. GOHMERT. And along those lines—I appreciate the gentleman yielding—we've heard the President say, well, you know, States require you to buy insurance for your car, so this is nothing new.

Mrs. BACHMANN. It's not the same.

Mr. GOHMERT. It is very new. Of course we've heard the argument that actually, yes, States do require you to buy insurance if you're going to drive a car. You don't have to own a car or drive a car to live in a State, not in any State.

But another thing that's lost in the equation too is there is no mandate by any State in this country to buy insurance to protect your own car and your own person. You are required to buy insurance to protect the other person whom you may harm while you're driving. And all of that is based on the privilege of driving, it is not based on just living.

We are supposed to have, under our Constitution, as was mentioned in the Declaration of Independence, this right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Whether you're an unborn child or whether you're an old geezer like some of us, you actually have a right to life. And here the Federal Government is saying we're going to snuff yours out a little early because we just don't find that you're all that productive. Where is that line drawn once they're allowed to say now you buy a product or you don't get to live here?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I have this other thought. It occurs to me, and I believe in H.R. 3200 there was an amendment offered that would have required Members of Congress to live under the same law. That offer for that exemption was voted down by Democrats. So if you had a bad policy, wouldn't you want to exempt yourselves from that?

I would ask the gentleman from Tennessee what he thinks of that.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I think you're absolutely right. I mean, it's the "do unto others, except don't do it to me."

Mr. KING of Iowa. Would you support language that would require that Members of Congress stand in the same shoes as the citizens of America?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. There is not one of us standing here now that wouldn't agree with that 100 percent.

And Congressman GOHMERT makes a good point about the mandate. Let's give some practical experience about what's happening to the mandate. Mandate means you have to purchase something, and in Massachusetts it's health insurance. It also says that you cannot be denied because of a preexisting condition. So the Harvard Pilgrim health care plan, beginning in March of 2008 until this year, 2009, 1 year, they found this, that almost half the people who got their health insurance through the Harvard Pilgrim plan kept it for an average of 5 months.

□ 1900

You couldn't turn them down, so they waited until they got sick, and when they got well, they dropped it. If you were in that 5-month period of time, that plan spent over \$2,000 a month on those folks. For the other folks, like me, who just bought it for the year, they averaged then about \$300 a month. So people scammed the system. They paid the tax until they got sick because it was cheaper than buying the health insurance. Then they bought the health insurance and kept it until they got well.

It's the same thing as using Congressman GOHMERT's example of a car wreck. Well, you have your car wreck, and then you buy the best car insurance policy you can, and when your car is fixed, you drop it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. It is so important also to note that, with all the talk about our friends across the aisle who are concerned about the working poor in America, if you look at the bill that was passed out of this House, it makes it very clear: if you can't afford the great policy that is mandated and if you're just above the poverty line where the government is going to pay for it, you'll have an additional 2½ percent income tax on your income. That is outrageous. Those are the people who, if they could afford to buy the insurance, they would buy the insurance. Now you're going to pop them with another 2½ percent tax. That's not caring about the working poor, about the people who are helping make the engine in this country go.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, it's quite likely that this fellow right here, the health choices administration, czarissioner, would probably rule that those high-deductible, high-copayment, low-premium policies wouldn't fit his idea of what health insurance is in America. So the low-income people who can only buy in, according to the way this thing was laid out in negotiations in the Senate, would have about four different tiers of policies.

It's interesting: those who have the lower premiums pay the least amount. Those who have the highest premiums pay the highest amount. The people who can pay the highest premiums are the ones who get the best kind of

health insurance out of that, and those who can afford the least have to have the highest copayment, but they can't do the high deductible because that doesn't fit the socialist model. That's part of what's going on.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If I could add to that, the one thing that doesn't get talked about very much here is the iron ceiling on wages that was contained in this bill.

If you have a double-income couple with no kids and if their combined income is \$64,000 a year or more, at that point they lose all Federal subsidy. So what they have to do is go out, and if their employers pay the 8 percent fine to the government and don't provide health insurance, they have to go with after-tax dollars and purchase health plans, which, in Minnesota, would cost about \$14,000 a year. So you'd have a couple making \$64,000 a year who has to go and buy a plan out-of-pocket; but if the couple made \$63,000 a year, Uncle Sam would pay their way. That's the iron ceiling on wages. There is no incentive to make a dollar more, because you would be so heavily penalized by going out of the subsidy, and that kills the American Dream.

Why would we have a couple of people here in this Chamber make a decision for over 300 million people? Let's free up decision-making for 300 million people to make the cheapest and best choices for themselves.

I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota and the other participants here tonight from across the board, from Tennessee and Texas.

I will just summarize what's going on here.

I think that a government-run health care system takes away our liberty. It nationalizes our bodies. It will result in increased costs and taxes. The taxes come in the form of mandates as well as whether we think we're paying taxes or premiums. It should not add to the crushing national debt or impose mandates. No tax dollars should go for abortions or for illegal aliens. It should be negotiated publicly, out in the daylight. It should apply to all Members of Congress. It should provide equal protection under the law. It should be free market-based, and it should protect the vital doctor-patient relationship.

That's the summary of what we want to do here, and it's what we have the opportunity to do because the cavalry came riding over the hill just in the nick of time in the form of, today, Senator-elect Scott Brown and, tomorrow, Massachusetts Senator Scott Brown.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I yield back the balance of my time.



CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TERRORISTS WHO THREATEN TO DISRUPT THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-88)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHAUER) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed: *To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 2010.

The crisis with respect to the grave acts of violence committed by foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that led to the declaration of a national emergency on January 23, 1995, has not been resolved. Terrorist groups continue to engage in activities that have the purpose or effect of threatening the Middle East peace process and that are hostile to United States interests in the region. Such actions constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process and to maintain in force the economic sanctions against them to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 20, 2010.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAYNE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, January 27.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, January 27.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, January 27.

Mr. GOODLATTE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, January 26 and 27.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on January 20, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 3788. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in 3900 Darrow Road in Stow, Ohio, as the "Corporal Joseph A. Tomci Post Office Building".

H.R. 3767. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 170 North Main Street in Smithfield, Utah, as the "W. Hazen Hillyard Post Office Building".

H.R. 3667. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16555 Springs Street in White Springs, Florida, as the "Clyde L. Hillhouse Post Office Building".

H.R. 3539. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 427 Harrison Avenue in Harrison, New Jersey, as the "Patricia D. McGinty-Juhl Post Office Building".

H.R. 3319. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 440 South Gulling Street in Portola, California, as the "Army Specialist Jeremiah Paul McCleery Post Office Building".

H.R. 3072. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9810 Halls Ferry Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Coach Jodie Bailey Post Office Building".

H.R. 2877. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 76 Brookside Avenue in Chester, New York, as the "1st Lieutenant Louis Allen Post Office".

H.R. 1817. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 116 North West Street in Somerville, Tennessee, as the "John S. Wilder Post Office Building".

H.R. 1377. To amend title 38, United States Code, to expand veteran eligibility for reimbursement by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for emergency treatment furnished in a non-Department facility, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 21, 2010, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5606. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-271, "Fiscal Year 2010 Income Tax Secured Revenue Bond and General Obligation Bond Issuance Temporary Approval Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5607. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-270, "Retirement Incentive Temporary Amendment Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5608. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-269, "African American Civil War Memorial Freedom Foundation, Inc. African-American Civil War Museum Approval Temporary Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5609. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-267, "Disclosure of Information to the Council Amendment Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5610. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-268, "Fiscal Year 2010 Limited Grant-Making Authority Clarification Temporary Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5611. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-263, "Public Land Surplus Standards Amendment Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5612. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-266, "Prescription Drug Dispensing Practices Reform Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5613. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-265, "Whistleblower Protection Amendment Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5614. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-264, "Fire Alarm Notice and Tenant Fire Safety Amendment Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5615. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 121 to Mile Marker 122, Above Head of Passes, in the vicinity of the I-310 Bridge, Luling, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-019] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5616. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety

Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 175 to Mile Marker 176, Above Head of Passes, Donaldsonville, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-020] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5617. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 229.4 to Mile Marker 230, Above Head of Passes, Baton Rouge, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-021] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5618. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 215 to Mile Marker 217, Above Head of Passes, Longwood, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-033] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5619. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 160 to Mile Marker 162, Above Head of Passes, Convent, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-034] (RIN: 1625-AA00), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5620. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 94 to Mile Marker 95.5, Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-035] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5621. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 89 to Mile Marker 91, Above Head of Passes, Algiers, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-037] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5622. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 87 to Mile Marker 88, Above Head of Passes, Chalmette, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-008] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5623. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 94 to Mile Marker 97, Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-009] (RIN: 1623-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5624. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 87 to Mile Marker 88, Above Head of Passes, Chalmette, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-010] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5625. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security

Zone; Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, the L & N Bridge at mile marker 2.9 to the Industrial Locks at mile marker 0.0, and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from Mile Marker 11.2 to Mile Marker 8.2, East of Harvey Lock, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-012] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5626. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 95 to Mile Marker 97, Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5627. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 138.5 to Mile Marker 139.5, Above Head of Passes, Reserve, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-014] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5628. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 303.0 to the Entrance of the Southwest Pass Safety Fairway, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-015] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5629. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Harvey Canal, Mile Marker 4.0 to Mile Marker 5.0, Above Head of Passes, Harvey, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-016] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5630. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 94.3 to Mile Marker 95.3, Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-017] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5631. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 228.8 to Mile Marker 229.8, Above Head of Passes, Baton Rouge, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-018] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5632. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, L & N Bridge to the Industrial Locks, and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway From Mile Marker 11.2 to Mile Marker 8.2, East of the Harvey Lock, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-007] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5633. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, 500 yards North and South of the Florida Avenue Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-100] (RIN:

1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5634. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Harvey Canal, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile Marker 1.7 to Mile Marker 1.9, in the vicinity of Houma Industries, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-104] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5635. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, Mile Marker 2.3 to Mile Marker 2.9, in the vicinity of the L&N Railroad Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-105] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5636. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Intracoastal Waterway, Mile Marker 11.9 to Mile Marker 12.1, West of the Harvey Locks, in the vicinity of the Wagner Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5637. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 156.0 to Mile Marker 157.0, extending the entire width of the river, St. James, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-002] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5638. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 94.0 to Mile Marker 96.0, Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5639. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 6 to Mile Marker 7, Above Head of Passes, Pilotown, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-004] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5640. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 94.5 to Mile Marker 95.5, Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-005] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5641. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 88 to Mile Marker 90, Above Head of Passes, Chalmette, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-006] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5642. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf of Mexico, Posit 29°26.8N 093°25.8W

[COTP Port Arthur-06-025] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5643. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf of Mexico, Posit 29°26.8N 093°25.8W [COTP Port Arthur-06-026] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5644. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ocean Beach Pier, Ocean Beach, CA [COTP San Diego 07-452] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5645. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Oceanside Pier, Oceanside, CA [COTP San Diego 07-552] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5646. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Red River, 500 yards North and South of the Long-Allen Bridge, Shreveport-Bossier City, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-094] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5647. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Quachita River, Mile Marker 168 to Mile Marker 169, in the vicinity of the Forsythe Recreational Boat Launch, Monroe, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-095] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5648. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, 500 yards North and South of the Florida Avenue Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-096] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5649. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, 500 yards North and South of the Florida Avenue Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-097] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5650. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, 500 yards North and South of the Florida Avenue Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-098] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5651. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 229.5 to Mile Marker 230.5, Baton Rouge, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-099] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

*[Omitted from the Record on January 19, 2010]*

H.R. 2989. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than February 26, 2010.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself and Mr. HOEKSTRA):

H.R. 4471. A bill to clarify that revocation of an alien's visa or other documentation is not subject to judicial review; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 4472. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to take action with respect to the Chicago waterway system to prevent the migration of bighead and silver carps into Lake Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 4473. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish an extended special enrollment period for individuals to enroll in part B of Medicare; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MINNICK (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 4474. A bill to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BACA, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. COLE, Mr. SHULER, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 4475. A bill to amend sections 14006 and 14007 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 to reserve funds under the programs established under such sections for payments to the Bureau of Indian Education of the Department of the Interior for Indian children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 4476. A bill to suspend the current compensation packages for the senior executives of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and establish compensation for such positions in accordance with rates of pay for senior employees in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 4477. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to establish a medical surveillance system to identify members of the Armed Forces exposed to chemical hazards resulting from the disposal of waste in Iraq and Af-

ghanistan, to prohibit the disposal of waste by the Armed Forces in a manner that would produce dangerous levels of toxins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 4478. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to direct the President to take actions to address the needs of children and families who are victims of a major disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 4479. A bill to enforce discretionary spending limits to rein in spending, reduce the deficit, and regain control of the Federal budget process; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 4480. A bill to amend the Community Services Block Grant Act to authorize appropriations for national or regional instructional programs for low-income youth; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 4481. A bill to reduce the Federal budget deficit in a responsible manner; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 4482. A bill to apply recaptured taxpayer investments toward reducing the national debt; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 4483. A bill to prohibit compensation for any officer or employee of the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, during any conservatorship or receivership of such enterprise, in an amount exceeding the compensation provided to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARDOZA:

H. Con. Res. 229. Concurrent resolution supporting the designation of the facility under development by the Stanislaus County Ag Center Foundation, in Stanislaus County, California, as the National Ag Science Center; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Res. 1019. A resolution recognizing the fifth anniversary of the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement between the Government of the Republic of the Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army and calling for urgent and aggressive actions to establish peace in all regions of Sudan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MARKEY of Colorado (for herself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado):

H. Res. 1020. A resolution honoring the 95th anniversary of the signing of the Rocky Mountain National Park Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Mrs.

CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. NORTON, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SRES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. WATT):

H. Res. 1021. A resolution expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake of January 12, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MASSA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. CHU, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WATT, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Ms. WATERS):

H. Res. 1022. A resolution honoring the life and sacrifice of Medgar Evers and congratulating the United States Navy for naming a supply ship after Medgar Evers; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANCE:

H. Res. 1023. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to remove the authority of the Committee on Rules to waive clause 5 of rule XVI or clause 9 of rule XXII; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H. Res. 1024. A resolution expressing support for designation of January as Poverty in America Awareness Month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 211: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 213: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 235: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 273: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 391: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 460: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 537: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 558: Mr. TONKO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 678: Mr. HOLT and Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 690: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 772: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 847: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1079: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1132: Mr. McCAUL.

H.R. 1351: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1378: Mr. McNERNEY, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1392: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 1469: Mr. SHULER, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. McNERNEY.

H.R. 1557: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1708: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1806: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1816: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 1826: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1855: Mr. SCHAUER.

H.R. 1964: Mr. CLAY and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 2043: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2067: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 2084: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 2135: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2149: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2243: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.

H.R. 2254: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 2296: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 2305: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 2324: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 2443: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2446: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 2455: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. MASSA.

H.R. 2497: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2546: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 2555: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 2565: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 2730: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 2981: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.

H.R. 3019: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 3092: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 3101: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 3144: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 3264: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 3359: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.

H.R. 3381: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 3412: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 3458: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 3480: Ms. BALDWIN and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 3486: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3491: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 3564: Mr. COSTA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3577: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 3578: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 3615: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 3652: Mrs. BONO MACK.

H.R. 3695: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 3734: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3757: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 3758: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.

H.R. 3764: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 3790: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.

H.R. 3885: Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 3888: Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 3936: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 3995: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 4003: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 4014: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 4044: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 4065: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 4070: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4099: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 4128: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 4129: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 4140: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4186: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 4188: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4191: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 4192: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 4196: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WU, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 4198: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 4199: Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 4227: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 4233: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 4239: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 4255: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 4260: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 4269: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 4278: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 4295: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 4296: Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 4302: Ms. RICHARDSON and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 4329: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 4330: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 4332: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 4370: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4386: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 4396: Mr. BOREN and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 4400: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PERRIELLO, and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 4403: Mr. McNERNEY and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 4415: Mr. WOLF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 4462: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 4463: Mr. OLSON and Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 4464: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LATTI, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. GRANGER, and Ms. FALLIN.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.J. Res. 61: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 137: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Con. Res. 169: Mr. TIAHRT.

H. Con. Res. 170: Mr. ARCURI.

H. Res. 22: Mr. SNYDER.

H. Res. 363: Mr. ELLISON.

H. Res. 704: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HOLT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. FLEMING, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H. Res. 847: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H. Res. 873: Mr. GOHMERT.

H. Res. 888: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H. Res. 925: Mr. MURPHY of New York and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 947: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 960: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. PITTS.

H. Res. 967: Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 975: Mr. MASSA.

H. Res. 990: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WU, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HARPER, Mr.

SCHIFF, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 997: Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 1003: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HARE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. OBEY, Mr. WATT, Ms. TITUS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FARR, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. KILROY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BERRY, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H. Res. 1006: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H. Res. 1009: Ms. HARMAN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Res. 1010: Mr. SABLAN.

H. Res. 1011: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BOCCIERI, Ms. CHU, Mrs. LUMMIS, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HODES, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. WEINER.

H. Res. 1013: Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 1018: Mr. WAXMAN.

---

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4191: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.